

SENATE—Tuesday, April 24, 1984

The Senate met at 11 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Our prayer this morning will be offered by the Reverend Dr. John William Lancaster, pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Houston, Tex. Dr. Lancaster is sponsored by the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

PRAYER

The Reverend John William Lancaster, D.D., pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Houston, Tex., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, Your servants gather to consider issues and make decisions affecting the lives of millions of people. They face depressing conditions in the world, distortions in our society, conflicts and burdens in their own personal lives. This is all the more reason for seeking divine undergirding and guidance. So, fresh from the celebration of resurrected faith, would we begin our season of prayer on the high note of thanksgiving and praise. We give thanks for people who demonstrate Your love. We offer praise for our great country and gratitude for the lavish gifts which come from You.

May neither the work of Your servants in this room nor the Nation they love and serve become their god. Enable them constantly and consistently to distinguish gift from giver. As receiver of Your gifts, may they be sharers also. This we pray, each in our own way, but many of us in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I think it would be appropriate at this point to yield first to the distinguished junior Senator from Texas, which I now do.

REV. JOHN W. LANCASTER

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his courtesy and kindness.

Mr. President, the Reverend Jack Lancaster has been my pastor at the First Presbyterian Church of Houston for the past 15 years. During that time, he has been more than a spiritual counselor for me and my family; he has been a trusted friend, a source of strength and wisdom and compassion for that large and diverse congregation.

Reverend Lancaster has been at the First Presbyterian Church of Houston since 1961. After defending America in the submarine service during World War II, he attended Austin College and graduated in 1947. He received a B.D. from Union Theological Seminary in 1950 and a D.D. from Austin College in 1960. He has also studied at Princeton Theological Seminary and St. Andrews University in Scotland.

Reverend Lancaster serves on the board of Stillman College in Tuscaloosa, Ala. He is on the board of the Outreach Foundation of the Presbyterian Church and is a member of the advisory board of the Texas Center for Media Awareness.

Mr. President, Reverend Lancaster's academic credentials are impeccable; his record of civic service and involvement is impressive. He has become a leader in the Presbyterian Church.

These are impressive achievements, Mr. President. But those of us who have known Jack Lancaster over the years admire him most for the kindness, comfort, and inspiration he gives so generously to his parishioners.

Many years ago, William Penn said he expected to pass through life but once. He said:

If there is any kindness I can show, or any good thing I can do for any fellow being, let me do it now, and not defer or neglect it, as I shall not pass this way again.

Reverend Lancaster has made a career of doing good things for the people of Houston. Thousands of us are better off for his having passed this way. He is an articulate spokesman for his religion and a powerful force for goodness and justice in our community.

Mr. President, as the U.S. Senate returns from its Easter recess, I am pleased that Jack Lancaster, my friend and pastor, is able to deliver our opening prayer.

I thank the distinguished majority leader for his kindness in allowing me to speak at this time.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I have always admired the Senator from Texas and acknowledged the great qualities he has. He has today added another to his long list of accomplishments. He is also a Presbyterian. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I join in welcoming Dr. Lancaster to this pulpit. The Senate of the United States is a remarkable institution, and over the years it has had remarkable clergy who have given us the favor of attending and offering the opening prayer. We appreciate this contribution today.

We are especially grateful that Senator BENTSEN has made that possible, in cooperation with our distinguished Chaplain.

May I say parenthetically, Mr. President, that I come from a small town in Tennessee and a small church which has the distinction and blessing, as most small churches do, of usually having young preachers who are fresh out of the seminary. Not infrequently, when I listen to the first sermon of some of these new ministers, I feel inclined to ask for equal time. It is refreshing, indeed, to have a man who is of my denomination, who stands in this pulpit and utters words of wisdom, and who does not require the application of the equal time doctrine.

Mr. President, I once again thank the Senator from Texas.

ANSEL ADAMS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, with the death of Ansel Adams this past weekend, the Nation has lost a special citizen, and the world has lost a master artisan.

He was first and foremost a photographer. In his hands, photography was raised from a craft to an art, and his vivid images of the American landscape have become treasures virtually beyond price.

His affection for the physical world found expression not only in his photography but also in his active personal commitment to conservation.

His photographs are eloquent testimony to the glories of nature, and the combination of his artistry and his personal integrity and credibility made him an extraordinarily effective champion of his special cause.

The Nation mourns his death, but we will celebrate his long life and his brilliant, prolific work for generations to come.

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I say to the minority leader that I notice in the memorandum I have before me that we have not provided for a 2-hour recess today. I believe the minority does not have a caucus of its members today; however, we do on this side. Unless the minority leader objects, and I would be surprised if he did, I should like to provide the usual 2-hour recess for the Republican Caucus today.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the majority leader will yield, the minority leader will be very glad to cooperate with the majority leader in this

matter. If the majority leader wants to recess, we have no problem with that. If the majority leader wants to stay in session, we will guarantee that nothing will happen on our side to interfere with the Republican conference.

The majority leader has always been very considerate in this regard, and we would certainly want to respond in kind.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 2 P.M.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. President, since we have done that, I believe, every Tuesday almost without exception—perhaps without exception—I will now ask unanimous consent that at 12 noon today, the Senate stand in recess until 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MATTINGLY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, it is already provided that there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business until 12 noon, in which Senators may speak for not more than 5 minutes each, and then the recess just ordered will occur.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

At 2 o'clock, the Senate will resume consideration of the unfinished business, the Federal Boat Safety Act, and the question is on the reported amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

I say for the benefit of everyone present, especially for my friend the minority leader, so that no one is taken by surprise—and I think they will not be, because everyone understands the procedure that is being followed—that it will be my intention at 2 o'clock, after the bill is laid before the Senate, to seek recognition for the purpose of offering a leadership amendment.

I expect that to occur promptly at 2 p.m.

Now Mr. President, I noticed I have a special order today. Do I recall that the special order was to enhance the time of another Senator who had also requested a special order for today? Do I recall that the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) indicated at 5 a.m. in the morning when we were finishing our work that he might need more than 15 minutes and I offered to obtain a special order so that it could enhance the time available to him? Is that correct?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the majority leader.

Mr. BAKER. All right.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my special order time to the minority leader, and I think it would be more appropriate to be transacted in that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the majority leader is thoughtful as always, and I thank him.

May I ask the majority leader, is this the time? May I intrude at this point to ask some questions about the program?

Mr. BAKER. By all means.

Mr. BYRD. I am interested if the majority leader can state at this point what his *modus operandi* will be with reference to the measure that we will continue to debate and act on.

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Does he plan to offer the reconciliation measure that is on the calendar as an amendment first or will it go with the medicare amendment, or will it go with the appropriations cap? If he does not mind and can so state at this point, would he lay out his program in this regard?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the leadership amendment which will be offered will include the appropriations caps.

If the Senator will permit me, I will get a more thorough description of the amendment. Indeed, I will give the Senator a copy of the amendment.

I have shown the amendment to the Parliamentarian, and it is an amendment which if adopted, in the view of the Parliamentarian, would convert this bill into a reconciliation bill, but it is the budget package beyond that which had already been dealt with from the Finance Committee and does include the appropriations caps. Whether it includes the medicare provision or not I will have to examine and see.

Mr. BYRD. I would be interested in discussing with the majority leader the possible development of a time agreement on this measure, hopefully, rather than going the route of using the reconciliation measure which is on the calendar, which now has been reduced to a shell by virtue of the fact that the Senate has already adopted most, if not all, of the contents of that legislation.

I am very concerned about using the reconciliation measure as an amendment and then *ipso facto*, once that becomes adopted, it converts the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, as amended, into a reconciliation measure with all of the time strictures and germaneness strictures that are involved.

I should hope we would not have to go that way, and I feel that we probably could arrive at a time agreement that would accommodate the majority leader in all respects without having to resort to this very drastic action, as I see it, which has not been outlined, but which is certainly implied and quite obvious.

If I may impose upon the majority leader just a moment longer, I am concerned that there may have been in the past some peripheral action, very

minor in comparison, in which this process may have been followed. I am concerned, however, about moving on so large a scale in this direction. I think it could have far-reaching implications for the appropriations process. It could have far-reaching implications for the authorizations process and the committees that are therein involved. I would say that the party which is in the minority now, at some time in the future will be in the majority, and the majority party of today will at that same time be in the minority, and if the minority is subjected to this approach now, there will come a time when the current majority party will likewise be exposed to the same procedure.

So I am hoping that the majority leader would be willing to explore the possibility of a time agreement that would achieve his goal and at the same time would spare us of this other approach which I view with considerable concern.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the minority leader, and I am encouraged by the remarks of the minority leader to think that we might be able to work out time agreements. Indeed, I would be more than happy to sit down and try to do that.

I think we can accomplish my purpose and his at the same time. I think that since the form in which the leadership on this side would propose to offer this amendment is amendable, and in consultation with the Parliamentarian, I believe that it would be amendable, of course in one degree, and there are at least two other opportunities for amendment, there is ample opportunity for Members on both sides of the aisle to offer amendments, to offer total substitutes, to offer amendments to strike, a whole range of things that would not be affected by the reconciliation restraints at all, and to fully work the will of the Senate on both sides of the aisle before we get to the final step. The final step, however, would be to adopt an amendment which would in fact have the force and effect of reconciliation.

As the minority leader perhaps already knows, the reason for it on this side is that an essential element of the package that was put together on this side was to assure that the outyear levels were not mere statements of good intention but rather were embedded in the law by reconciliation. I am speaking primarily of the appropriations caps for the outyears.

Now that is something that I feel is necessary on this side to keep the matter held together, but I have no desire whatever to use reconciliation, nor will I try to limit the opportunity of any Senator on either side of the aisle to amend this bill, to offer substitutes for this bill, to strike and insert,

if that is permissible under the rules, or to strike altogether, and I will be most pleased to sit down with the minority leader and see if we cannot arrive at time agreements and the identification of the steps that will be taken on both sides of the aisle and to arrange the deliberation of the Senate on this amendment and on this bill, as amended, so that we have full freedom to act without any restraints, without any limitation from the reconciliation bill until after everyone has had his turn at bat.

But, after we have exhausted that process, then it would be the intention of the leadership on this side to proceed to try to convert then our work product, as perfected, as amended, if it is amended and it is dealt with, into a reconciliation posture in order to preserve the provisions of the act in the out years rather than the simple objective, as is the case in the budget resolution, for instance.

I will explore that further with the minority leader. Let me leave this subject by saying that I am anxious to explore time limitations and agreements. I am anxious to see that every Senator has an opportunity to proceed free of any impediment at all, other than perhaps the impediment of rule XXII, cloture, perhaps, and to cooperate in every way with the minority leader to see that that occurs.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, what the distinguished majority leader says relieves my concern only in part. I am not concerned about cloture. That is in the regular order of procedure. But I am concerned about converting an underlying bill into a reconciliation measure by the mere attachment of a reconciliation amendment. And this bothers me greatly.

The fact that all Senators will have an opportunity to amend or strike out and insert, and all that, is not so helpful at this point. If we had 51 votes on this side, that would be enough to relieve me, but that is not the case.

We do not have 51 votes on this side. The cloture aspect does not bother me so much, as of now—maybe it will trouble me more later when it manifests itself. My concern is simply that of attaching an amendment—which is now a reconciliation bill on the calendar—to the basic underlying measure and by that action resort to the fiction of converting that underlying measure into a reconciliation bill with all of its time and germaneness strictures.

I realize there has been an instance in the past when cloture was applied to a committee substitute and automatically the basic bill was likewise clotured. But this approach seems to me to be quite a leap, in using that precedent as analogous to what I see we may be about to do here.

I am willing, as I say, to sit down with the majority leader and attempt to work out some other procedure

whereby he can achieve, hopefully, his goal.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am sure my time has expired. I ask unanimous consent that the minority leader and I may proceed as necessary for another 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, do I have any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the minority leader remains and the majority leader's time has expired.

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. BAKER. It will not take but a moment, Mr. President.

But I would say, Mr. President, I started to say in my own defense, but I do not feel any defense is necessary—that the original plan which I stated in public and on the floor and discussed with the minority leader was to call up the reconciliation bill which is on the calendar and which has only 14 hours, I believe, remaining for debate, and then to offer an amendment to that reconciliation bill which would be the leadership amendment that I am now about to offer or will offer at 2 o'clock.

In that case, many of the concerns expressed by the minority leader would, indeed, be genuine and real concerns—they are all genuine—but they would be real and serious concerns. And, indeed, they are so serious that the minority leader, among others, convinced me that was not a good way to proceed; that we were establishing a precedent there which is perfectly within the rules and the statute but a precedent, nonetheless, for dealing with a major piece of legislation on a very, very limited time basis and subject to very stringent requirements for germaneness.

For instance, on the amendment itself, there would be 2 hours of debate. On the bill itself, there would be 14 hours of debate and germaneness would apply and substitutes probably would not be eligible because of germaneness.

So early on in these discussions and conversations, the leadership on this side decided that that original idea, while entirely practical and within the rules, was not the best way to proceed. And the minority leader should have the credit or the blame, as the case may be, for convincing me that that was not a good way to proceed.

But I agreed with that and, instead, modified the procedure so that we chose the boat bill, the revenue measure on the calendar, instead of calling up the reconciliation bill and offered the Finance Committee package, which was subject to unlimited debate. For a while I thought indeed it was going to go on forever. We were in until 11 o'clock one night, 9 o'clock, as I recall, on another night, and until 5 in the morning on another occasion

before we finally finished that package. But we did.

Now, we are in phase II and we are going to offer the appropriation caps, we are going to offer other matters that are in the leadership package, and, if it is adopted, the bill will become reconciliation, I believe the Chair will rule.

But, until that moment, the Senate is free to act completely unfettered by any time restraints, except as rule XXII might provide, or any germaneness requirements at all. So we have come a long way.

The only reason for this statement is to point out that I take seriously the concerns expressed by the minority leader. I share them and have attempted, in devising that strategy, to meet them while still maintaining the objective of keeping this package together, especially the appropriation caps, beyond the current year and into the out years so that everyone here and in the country can be assured that the Congress is not merely stating good intentions by enacting statute law.

Now, Mr. President, I hope that works satisfactorily. I will not prolong the matter. The minority leader and I have discussed this a number of times and he is fully aware of the design of this procedure.

I have done perhaps an unprecedented thing by providing the minority leader in advance detailed descriptions of how I intend to proceed. I hope that we can further elaborate on this arrangement so that we can arrive at time agreements on amendments, perhaps the identification of amendments to be offered, and perhaps even a time for final disposition of the amendment itself. I suppose that may be too much to hope for at this point, but I am bold and brazen enough to suggest that we try.

I apologize to Members for extending these remarks perhaps further than I should have.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the majority leader does not owe an apology to anyone. The Members, certainly on this side of the aisle, appreciate his frankness in laying out the future procedure as he sees it.

Beyond that, I say that, as to the appropriations caps, this is also somewhat revolutionary as it will be embraced in this particular package. There is considerable concern—and should be—on this side of the aisle, and should be on both sides, about using the approach with reference to both the reconciliation amendment, which is the bill on the calendar, and also imposing the appropriations caps. That will suffice for now with respect to what I said in the hope that we might be able to work with the majority leader in devising some approach perhaps a little short of

what he hopes for. But he presumably has the votes, and probably can achieve his goal in the long run.

Mr. President, I yield my remaining time to Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to consider a possible accommodation to this Senator on the schedule?

Mr. BAKER. I yield.

REFORM OF DISABILITY DETERMINATION PROCESS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I understand that sometime before morning business is over the Senator would require that we proceed with House bill 3755, and that second reading take place of that bill because it has been held at the desk. Would it be possible to do that now so that I could in turn object to further proceeding on the bill, and it could be placed on the calendar?

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Senator.

If the minority leader is agreeable, I am perfectly agreeable to the procedure.

Mr. BYRD. Yes. We have no problem.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3755) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for reform in the disability determination process.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I object to further proceeding on this bill.

I thank the majority leader for accommodating me, and also the minority leader for his advice on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under rule XIV, paragraph 4, and the Senate's precedents, objection having been heard to further proceedings on this bill, after its second reading, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I request that the Chair put the majority leader's request—because otherwise under rule XIV I do not think it would have been appropriate—at this particular point in today's business. I think the majority leader made the request.

Mr. BAKER. I made the request.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that be done at this point rather than at the close of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, does the record reflect that the request was made, and granted, that it be in order at this point to proceed in the manner in which the Senator from Michigan did proceed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is correct.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

ORDER FOR RECESS FROM 12:30 P.M. UNTIL 2 P.M.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am using more time than I had planned. We have three special orders plus morning business. If the minority leader does not object, I ask unanimous consent that the recess begin at 12:30 p.m. instead of 12 o'clock and extend until 2 p.m. as previously ordered, and that the time for morning business will begin at the expiration of the special order of times under the terms and conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

I thank the minority leader, and I especially thank the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Michigan for forbearing to claim their time so that this colloquy could occur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

ARE THE SOVIETS REALLY RACING AHEAD IN NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL ARMS RACE?

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, what happens every April besides showers, springtime, daffodils, green grass, and the opening of the baseball season? Answer: The Pentagon tells us that the Russians are coming right on cue on April 10. This year, Secretary Caspar Weinberger issued the Defense Department report which charges that the Soviets enjoy a big quantitative advantage over the United States in several aspects of all three of the major areas of procurement: strategic nuclear weapons, conventional weapons, and biological and chemical warfare.

Mr. President, it just happens that this "Russians are coming" Pentagon report appears at precisely the time the Armed Services Committee is preparing to come to the floor of the Senate with the Pentagon wish list for weapons. What a coincidence! How remarkable that every year this same coincidence recurs. The Pentagon tells us the Russians are amassing a colossal military arsenal. They tell us this just a few days before the Senate will act on the Pentagon's wish list. In the past, as the year goes on we find that the Russians are not 10 feet tall. And this year there is a particular reason to take a long, skeptical look as the Pentagon cries "Wolf!"

Here is why: Buried deep in the report is the admission that the Soviets have not significantly increased their rate of procurement spending since the mid-seventies. The Pentagon claims that the Russian military procurement simply leveled off at a higher rate than U.S. military pro-

curement. Mr. President, this admission—that the Soviet Union has not increased the rate of their military procurement buildup for nearly 10 years—is the most important disclosure in this year's Pentagon report. Last year, the CIA told a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee the same thing.

The myth of Russians 10 feet tall has been fabricated around the thesis that the Soviet Union was making extraordinary efforts to pour ever-greater resources into military procurement. The intelligence community believed that the Russians had been pushing 13 to 14 percent of their gross national product into the military, and that in the decade of the seventies they accelerated that to 14 to 16 percent. Many U.S. intelligence forecasts contended that if Soviet defense spending continued to grow at the historical rate, their military burden could increase to 20 percent by the end of the 1980's. In fact, the CIA estimates show an overall increase in military spending between 1976 and 1981 of only 2 percent in real terms, which is less than the growth of the Soviet GNP, and no increase in Soviet military procurement whatsoever. In fact, there has been a slowdown in the production of missiles, aircraft, surface ships, submarines, tanks, and many other categories. Just as in U.S. military procurement, there have been advances in military technology which have increased the unit cost of production. But the CIA has concluded that unit cost increases have not totally offset the reduced quantities in cost.

Mr. President, this Senator would not minimize the size or cost or military power of the Soviet buildup. The Soviets are, indeed, building a large number of weapons. In some areas, such as tanks, their numbers substantially exceed ours. But the impression that the Secretary of Defense gives of a relentless year-by-year growth of Soviet military power is hardly borne out by the facts. How relentless is a buildup that actually slowed in overall military spending in the latter half of the seventies from about 4 percent to 2 percent? How relentless is a buildup of military procurement that apparently did not grow at all since 1976?

The fascinating question on the Soviet Union military forces is not why the buildup, but why the slowdown? Was it because of industrial and agricultural bottlenecks in the civilian economy that spilled over to the defense industries? Were there Russian problems in assimilating new technology? Were there policy decisions such as compliance with SALT I and SALT II agreements? In the past, the Defense Department has emphasized the growth of Soviet military spending. They have often exaggerated that growth. But they have had a case of

sorts. Now the Soviet Union has slowed its overall military growth and actually brought its growth in military procurement to a halt.

We have discovered this at a time when we have been sharply increasing our own rate of military spending. And the alibi for that U.S. increase has always been to match the Soviet Union's growth. No Senator I know of—certainly not this Senator—has proposed that we match the Russians by cutting our military growth down to 2 percent or stop the rate of growth in real terms for our procurement.

Indeed, Congress will certainly increase our overall military spending allowing fully for inflation by at least 5 percent this year, and our military procurement by a great deal more. Indeed, the President's fiscal year 1985 request for procurement in that budget is a record \$107.6 billion, a smashing 25-percent increase—25 percent, Mr. President—in budget authority over 1984. The President has since agreed to a lesser increase and Congress may narrow the increase in military procurement outlays to 15 or even 10 percent. But since Congress has shown no disposition to back away from any of the immensely expensive new weapons systems the President has called for, any reduction in the rate of procurement increase is likely to be a temporary deferment requiring even greater outlays in coming years.

What does all this do to the Weinberger thesis that the Russians are speeding up the arms race? The CIA tells us that for nearly 10 years, Russian procurement has been flat, with no increase in the real rate of spending. Meanwhile, our own military spending moves relentlessly and sharply ahead.

THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, today is the 69th anniversary of Armenian Martyrs Day, a day on which we honor the memory of 1.5 million Armenians massacred between 1915-23 by the Ottoman Empire.

The Armenian genocide is often considered the "forgotten genocide" of the 20th century. Unlike the Nazi persecution of the Jews, this tragic event is little known and seldom recognized.

Had the world taken ample note of this terrible crime and held those responsible for this horror accountable, it is very possible that the Holocaust of World War II could have been avoided. In fact, as Hitler was planning the extermination of the Jews, he asked rhetorically, "Who remembers the Armenians?" Hitler, unfortunately, was right.

In this age of mass communication, it is difficult to understand how the world could have taken so little notice of a crime of this magnitude.

The pattern of their persecution dates back to 1894, when, in a 2-year period, 200,000 Armenians were massacred under the reign of Ottoman Sultan Abdul Hamid II. Later, in 1909, 21,000 Cilician Armenians were massacred. Finally, in the first genocide of the 20th century, the Turks killed 1.5 million Armenians and exiled another 500,000 from their homes. Despite the protests of numerous diplomatic observers, the nations of the world were not moved to action and many failed to even take notice of this tragedy.

The pattern of ignorance continues even today. Just 2 years ago, the State Department's official bulletin noted that the Department of State found the historical record ambiguous and, therefore, took no official position on the events surrounding this "allegation" of genocide.

At that time, many of my colleagues and I protested this historical revisionism on the part of the State Department. The documentation of the Armenian genocide is clear and irrefutable. It is an historical fact, and we cannot conveniently overlook it for diplomatic expediency.

Such efforts to rewrite history are an insult to both justice and memory.

Mr. President, that is why it is important that the Senate take notice of Armenian Martyrs Day. Today we affirm the reality of the Armenian genocide as a historical fact and we use it as an opportunity to educate another generation of the ultimate horror of which man can be capable. And we rededicate ourselves to insure that such tragedies will never occur again.

But this rededication must not be a mere idle pledge. It must be an affirmative, active step.

We have the means at our disposal. The Genocide Convention is still pending before the Senate awaiting our advice and consent.

Ratification of this treaty would be the highest tribute we could give to the memory of the Armenian martyrs. The Genocide Convention would clearly affirm our commitment for the right of all national, ethnic, racial, and religious groups to live free from fear of destruction. It would firmly establish in international law the principle that criminals who even attempt such crimes will be firmly punished.

What better step could we take in honor of these martyrs than such a decisive step?

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring these martyrs by seeking Senate ratification of the Genocide Convention.

Mr. President, I am happy to yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR LEVIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Michigan is recognized.

69TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN MARTYRS DAY

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, for his constancy in the cause of obliterating genocide from the face of the Earth.

Every April 24, Armenians all over the world take pause to honor the memory of the 1.5 million Armenians massacred between 1915-23 by the Turkish Ottoman Empire, a tragic event which is recorded by eyewitness accounts in historical archives throughout the world.

This historical record documents the crime perpetrated against the Armenian nation and people by the Turkish Ottoman Government as the first genocide of the 20th century. Whosoever denies it must not be allowed to succeed in rewriting history. The historical archives reveal eyewitness accounts of survivors, journalists, government officials and missionaries of many nations—eyewitness accounts which shocked all civilized mankind.

But, regrettably it was soon forgotten, not by the surviving Armenians, but by most of the rest of the world. So that when Adolf Hitler planned his invasion of Poland and the destruction of Jewish people, he was able to scornfully state, "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians (?)."

This day serves as a tragic reminder that the first genocide of the 20th century became the precedent for the Holocaust of World War II. The line from Armenia to Auschwitz is a direct one.

Mr. President, when one compares to two genocides, the similarities are startling:

The Turks set the stage for the genocide by calling Armenians a suspect people sympathetic to the Western powers of World War I. Later, the Nazis increasingly depicted the Jewish people as enemies of the Third Reich, which, too, set the stage for the Holocaust.

The Turks used the cover of a world war to deport and annihilate the Armenian people. The Nazis used the chaos of World War II to deport the Jewish people to concentration camps outside of Germany, where they were later murdered.

The Turks tried to conceal the Armenian genocide from their own citizens and the world, as they still do today. The Nazis did, as well.

If the Armenians of 1915 had been remembered, if the perpetrators of their genocide were punished by a

world tribunal, and if international laws had been enacted preventing the heinous crime of genocide, 6 million Jews might not have perished at the hands of the Nazis.

The world did not learn a lesson from the Armenian genocide. By commemorating the memory of these victims, we can try once again to prevent history from repeating itself. Such tragedies can only be prevented in the future if they are remembered. This is the legacy our ancestors left to the surviving generations—a legacy which we pay tribute to today. It is a legacy which also was recently honored in a joint commemoration of the Armenian genocide and the Jewish Holocaust by the Armenian Club and B'Nai Israel Club of Central Michigan University.

The students at Central Michigan University realized that this legacy represents a challenge—a challenge not to back down from efforts of the Turkish Government to rewrite history; a challenge not to back down from continued and unacceptable blunders from our own State Department, which said in the August 1982 issue of its official magazine, the *Bulletin*:

Because the historical record of the 1915 events in Asia minor is ambiguous, the Department of State does not endorse allegations that the Turkish Government committed a genocide against the Armenian people.

That was an unbelievable and outrageous denial of decades of U.S. policy which infuriated me and others in Congress, as it did the Armenian community and those students of history who know the difference between fact and fiction. The State Department, 8 long months later, finally retracted the statement by writing:

The article . . . which appeared in the August 1982 issue of the *Bulletin* . . . (was) not intended as statements of policy of the United States. Nor did they represent any change in U.S. policy.

That clarification of course, should not have been necessary to make in the first place. But it now seems another clarification, unfortunately is needed. It is needed, I am saddened to say, because of an incident that I have learned of after returning from the spring recess.

On April 11, House Joint Resolution 247, a measure which would have created a "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man" by designating April 24, 1984—today—as a day to honor all victims of genocide, especially those 1.5 million Armenian genocide victims of the Turkish Ottoman Empire, was brought to the House floor for consideration. But it was objected to by one Member and set aside, as required under the rule of unanimous consent. Congressman TONY COELHO of California, the main sponsor of the resolution which had 228 cosponsors, spoke as follows in the House the next day:

One lone voice opposed this measure. But I wanted to let it be known that there was a stronger voice which opposed this resolution—the State Department. . . . Mr. Lewis Murray of the European Affairs Desk at the State Department phoned my office to express the State Department's dissatisfaction with the resolution. He not only expressed the State Department's dissatisfaction, but he went as far as to say that the resolution was irresponsible and that it would have a negative impact if passed. He alleged that, if passed, this resolution would:

First, encourage terrorism, and second, muck up relations with the Turkish Government. But perhaps his greatest effort in his argument to dissuade me from having the resolution brought to the floor was adding that the Armenian genocide has never been documented.

Mr. President, enough is enough. It pains me to even have to address these ignorant charges which were made by a State Department official who is seemingly oblivious of the historical record and previous policy statements of the United States. Let no one misunderstand our meaning or the meaning of today's commemoration.

The struggle which has manifested itself in the American political process is a struggle which must be fought solely in the political arena. The refusal of the Turkish Government, and now, again, by a State Department refusal to acknowledge the Ottoman Empire's role in the Armenian genocide, as the New York Times has written:

In no way justifies a minuscule group of Armenian terrorists, who in a decade have killed 26 Turkish diplomats. But it surely justifies using the memorial day, as less vengeful Armenians ask with increasing urgency, to call for an accounting of a dark and unpunished crime.

As for "mucking up relations with the Turkish Government," it is time for us to insist that Turkey fully observe the fundamental freedoms of its people and link our foreign assistance to an improved Turkish record on human rights.

Mr. President, in order to help respond to the State Department's representative's unbelievable claim that the Armenian genocide has never been documented, I ask unanimous consent that the following factsheets and newspaper articles, which were provided to me by the Armenian Assembly, a national nonprofit organization representing the Armenian-American community, be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

FACTSHEET: THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

During the second half of the nineteenth century, the Armenian population of the Ottoman (Turkish) Empire became the target of heightened persecution by the Ottoman government. These persecutions culminated in a three decade period during which the Armenians were systematically uprooted from their homeland of 3,000

years and eliminated through massacres of exile.

THE PATTERN OF PERSECUTION: 1894-1924

1894-1896: 200,000 Armenians massacred during the reign of the Ottoman Sultan Abdul Hamid II.

1909: 21,000 Armenians massacred in Cilicia.

1915-1923: 1,500,000 Armenians perished, and more than 500,000 were exiled from their homes in the Ottoman Empire.

At the beginning of World War I, there were some 2,500,000 Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire. Since the Armenian Genocide, fewer than 100,000 declared Armenians reside in Turkey. Armenian citizens of Russia were also subject to massacre during the Turkish invasions of 1918 and 1920.

MOBILIZATION FOR WORLD WAR I SETS THE STAGE FOR GENOCIDE

1. On August 2, 1914, general mobilization of the Turkish army was declared. Like their fellow Turkish citizens, all able-bodied Armenian men, with few exceptions, were called up for military service. Beginning in February, 1915, the Armenians in the armed forces were segregated into labor battalions, disarmed, and ultimately worked to death or massacred.

2. Also in August, 1914, the Young Turk government began to release murderers and other confirmed criminals from prisons throughout Asia Minor and placed them in the Special Organization (Teshkileti Mahsusa) for the express purpose of ending the "Armenian Question" by annihilating the Armenians. Whole villages were massacred outright in the fall and winter of 1914 in the eastern provinces.

3. In February, 1915, the Turkish government disarmed the Armenian mountaineers of Zeitun, near Marash, and deported the population to the Salt Desert near Konia, or to the Syrian desert. Packed into boxcars, or forced to walk often without food or water for days, they quickly perished. Deportations and massacres soon became the plight of Armenians in other areas.

4. On April 24, 1915, about 200 Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were arrested in Constantinople (Istanbul) exiled, or taken to the interior and murdered. Similar measures were executed throughout the empire in all Armenian centers.

5. The Edict of Deportation was formally promulgated on May 27, 1915. Soon afterwards, Armenians throughout the Ottoman Empire were deported on short notice. Men were usually separated from the group and massacred. The remaining women, children, and elderly were marched across Asia Minor and Turkish Armenia to the Syrian desert, constantly attacked by brigands and the Special Organization "guards" who were ostensibly to offer protection. Thousands were kidnapped. Most of the deportees were massacred or died of starvation, disease, or exposure.

6. Approximately 500,000 Armenian refugees escaped to the north across the Russian border, south into Arab countries, or to Europe and the United States. Thus, the Armenians of the Ottoman Empire were virtually eliminated from their ancestral homeland as a result of a carefully executed government plan of genocide.

7. Armenians who did return from exile to their homes following World War I found conditions uncertain, despite assurances by the Allies that their lives and property would be secure. With the rise of Mustapha

Kemal (Ataturk) beginning in 1919, the Armenians again were subjected to waves of massacres. Those who survived either fled or were expelled by the Kremalist regime in 1922-25.

FACTSHEET: U.S. RECOGNITION OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

During the second half of the nineteenth century, the Armenian population of the Ottoman (Turkish) Empire became the target of heightened persecution by the Ottoman government. These persecutions culminated in a three-decade period during which the Armenians were systematically uprooted from their homeland of 3,000 years and eliminated through massacres or exile.

The United States Archives are replete with material documenting the premeditated extermination of the Armenian people, as well as American interventions to prevent the full realization of Turkey's genocidal plan and humanitarian assistance for those who survived. The U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, Henry Morgenthau, acting on instructions from Secretaries of State William Jennings Bryan and Robert Lansing, organized and led protests by all nations, among them Turkey's allies, over what Ambassador Morgenthau referred to as Turkey's program of "race extermination." The archives also demonstrate that the American people, through an organization known as Near East Relief chartered by an act of Congress, contributed some \$113 million between 1915 and 1930 to aid the Armenian Genocide survivors. In addition, 132,000 orphans became foster children of the American people and owe their lives to this effort.

U.S. REAFFIRMATION—A PARTIAL CHRONOLOGY

July 16, 1915—Telegram from U.S. Ambassador Henry Morgenthau to the Secretary of State:

"Deportation of and excesses against peaceful Armenians is increasing and from harrowing reports of eye witnesses it appears that a campaign of race extermination is in progress under a pretext of reprisal against rebellion."

May 13, 1920—Senate Resolution 359:

"... the testimony adduced at the hearings conducted by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations have clearly established the truth of the reported massacres and other atrocities from which the Armenian people have suffered."

April 8, 1975—House Joint Resolution 148: "Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that April 24, 1975, is hereby designated as 'National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man', and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day as a day of remembrance for all the victims of genocide, especially those of Armenian ancestry who succumbed to the genocide perpetrated in 1915, and in whose memory this date is commemorated by all Armenians and their friends throughout the world."

May 11, 1976—Hearing, U.S. House of Representatives Committee on International Relations Subcommittee on Future Foreign Policy Research and Development Investigation Into Certain Past Instances of Genocide and Exploration of Policy Options for the Future, Opening Statement by Chairman Lester Wolff:

"We have before us a panel of distinguished guests who will provide us with a

wealth of information on the first genocidal tragedy of the 20th century, that which befell the Armenian people in the years 1910-20 when 1.5 million people were killed or driven from their homes and left to die. Our purpose in this is twofold. We shall examine this tragedy as part of the broader problem of genocide and also to determine whether the repercussions of the tragedy are still being felt today."

May 16, 1978—Speech by former President Jimmy Carter at the White House:

"... it's generally not known in the world that in the years preceding 1916, there was a concerted effort made to eliminate all the Armenian people, probably one of the greatest tragedies that ever befell any group. And there weren't any Nuremberg trials."

April 24, 1980—Speech by U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council Director Monroe Freedman:

"Today we recall in sorrow the million and one-half Armenians who were tortured, starved, and butchered to death in the First Genocide of the Twentieth Century."

April 22, 1981—Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust Proclamation 4838, by President Ronald Reagan:

"Like the genocide of the Armenians before it, and the genocide of the Cambodians which followed it—and like too many other such persecutions of too many other peoples—the lessons of the Holocaust must never be forgotten."

April 30, 1981—Days of Remembrance Commemoration, Capitol Rotunda Speech by U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council Chairman Elie Wiesel:

"Before the planning of the final solution, Hitler asked, 'Who remembers the Armenians?' He was right. No one remembered them, as no one remembered the Jews. Rejected by everyone, they felt expelled from history."

March 1983—U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council booklet entitled Armenian Genocide Commemorative Fund:

"The 1915-23 genocide of the Armenian citizens of the Ottoman Turkish Empire will have a place of prominence in the Holocaust Museum. Approval by the Holocaust Council was unanimous."

[An editorial from the New York Times, Apr. 23, 1983]

ARMENIAN MEMORY, TURKISH AMNESIA

The saddest date on the Armenian calendar is April 24, when a scattered people remembers a catastrophe most of us have forgotten. It happened in 1915, when a large and thriving Armenian community in Turkey became the object of the century's first official genocide.

It was a gruesome campaign, resulting in the death or deportation of perhaps 1.5 million of 2.3 million Turkish Armenians. Yet the perpetrators faced no judicial inquiry, no ministers resigned in disgrace and subsequent Turkish Governments have declined even to acknowledge what happened.

This amnesia in no way justifies a minuscule group of Armenian terrorists, who in a decade have killed 26 Turkish diplomats. But it surely justifies using the memorial day, as less vengeful Armenians ask with increasing urgency, to call for an accounting of a dark and unpunished crime.

A stateless people, Armenians were vulnerably located on both sides of the Eastern Front when World War I pitted Germany and the Ottoman Empire against Czarist Russia, Britain and France. Islamic Turkey looked on Christian Armenians as collective-

ly suspect—even, according to one theorist, an "alien impurity."

"Alas, those who were innocent today might be guilty tomorrow," explained Turkey's Interior Minister, who ordered the deportation of entire communities and condoned plunder and murder by Turkish troops, beginning in April 1915.

The killings appalled German diplomats, who had no motive for exaggeration. Their dismay was shared by the American envoy, Henry Morgenthau Sr., who fed eyewitness accounts to foreign journalists. The weight of the evidence makes credible an Ottoman document, dated Sept. 16, 1915, asserting that the regime's purpose was "to destroy completely all the Armenians living in Turkey."

As shocking as what happened was what didn't. Much of the world protested, but with little effect and with numbed incredulity. An account of a ferocious killing on the shores of Lake Van prompted this meditation in *The New Republic*: "Humanity refuses to think that a civilized nation was even fractionally responsible for such desolation."

In that refusal, Franz Werfel foresaw other horrors. His powerful novel, "The Forty Days of Musa Dagh," describes a meeting between Turkey's Defense Minister, Enver Pasha, and a German pastor. Suppose Germany had enemies in its midst, said Enver, "shall we say, Poles or Social Democrats or Jews. . . . Would you consider it so cruel if, for the sake of victory, all dangerous elements in the population were simply herded together and sent packing into distant, uninhabited territory? . . . There can be no peace between human beings and plague germs."

Werfel, a Czech-German Jew, was writing in 1933. He later fled Germany, and died in America in 1945, when what began in Anatolia had produced Auschwitz.

KARL E. MEYER.

[The following articles were published in the New York Times from Mar. 20, 1915 to June 1, 1919]

WHOLE PLAIN STREWN BY ARMENIAN BODIES

LONDON, March 19.—Appalling accounts of conditions in Armenia have reached the officials in London of the Armenian Red Cross Fund and have been given out by them.

The latest recital is from an Armenian doctor named Dardarian, who says that the whole plain of Alashgerd is virtually covered with the bodies of men, women, and children.

When the Russian forces retreated from this district the Kurds fell upon the helpless people and shut them up in mosques. The men were killed and the women were carried away to the mountains.

The organisers of the Red Cross Fund say there are 130,000 destitute Armenians now in the Caucasus.

PETROGRAD, March 19.—A telegram from Urumish, Northwestern Persia, says that prior to the evacuation of towns between Jufia and Tabriz the "Turks and Kurds, who were retreating before the Russian advance, pillaged and burned the villages and put to death some of the inhabitants."

At Salmas, Pagaduk, and Sarna orders are said to have been given by the Turkish Commissioner for the destruction of the towns.

All the Armenian inhabitants of Antvat were collected and, according to this mes-

sage, 600 males were put to death, and the women, after being compelled to embrace the Mohammedan faith, were divided into parties and sent to various interior towns.

APPEAL TO TURKEY TO STOP MASSACRES

WASHINGTON, April 27.—An appeal for relief of Armenian Christians in Turkey, following reported massacres and threatened further outrages, was made to the Turkish Government today by the United States.

Acting upon the request of the Russian Government, submitted through Ambassador Bakhmeteff, Secretary Bryan cabled to Ambassador Morgenthau at Constantinople to make representations to the Turkish authorities asking that steps be taken for the protection of imperiled Armenians and to prevent the recurrence of religious outbreaks.

Ambassador Bakhmeteff called at the State Department late today with a dispatch from his Government, which included an appeal to the President of the United States for aid, forwarded through the Russian Government from the Catholics of the Armenian Church at Etchmiadzin in the Caucasus.

"The request from the head of the Armenian Church to this Government, forwarded through the Russian Ambassador," said Secretary Bryan, "is the first official notice the department has received of the reported Armenian massacres. Our action was taken as a matter of humanity."

The Russian Embassy today gave out a translation of a recent speech by the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Duma, in which the presence of Russian troops in Persia was explained. The Foreign Minister said:

"The presence of our troops in Persian territory by no means involves a violation of Persian neutrality. Our detachments were sent to that country some years ago for the definite purpose of establishing and maintaining order in districts contiguous to our possessions of high economic importance to us also to prevent the seizure of some of these districts by the Turks, who openly strove to create for themselves there especially in the district of Urumiah a convenient base for military operations against the Caucasus." The Persian Government not having the actual power to maintain its neutrality met the Turkish violation of the latter with protests, which, however, had no results.

MORE ARMENIAN MASSACRES

TELIS, TRANSCAUCASIA (via Petrograd and London), June 5.—After the occupation by the Russians of Van Turkin Armenia, bands of Kurds continued to commit atrocities in the district of Bitlis, Moush and Diarbekr, Armenian volunteers in increasing numbers are fighting desperately to protect the Christian population from the Kurds. Inhabitants of Diarbekr, following the example of the Armenians in Van, have organized armed bands.

The population of Urumiah, in Persia, Armenia, greeted the Russians with enthusiasm. Food for the refugees in the American missions was brought by the Russians. The consulates at Urumian and Van have suffered little in the fighting which has been going on during the last few months.

The successes of the Russians in these districts are creating dissatisfaction among the Persians and Arabians. Disorders are developing.

The concentration by the Turks of military efforts on the Dardanelles has caused a shortage of arms and ammunition for their

troops in the Caucasus. A portion of the artillery has been removed from the Turkish forts at Erzerum, the principal city of Turkish Armenia.

WHOLESALE MASSACRES OF ARMENIANS BY TURKS

LONDON, July 28.—The Earl of Crewe, Lord President of the Council, replying in the House of Lords today to a question by Viscount Bryce, concerning the killing of Christians in Armenia by the Turks, said the information received at the Foreign Office showed that such crimes had recently increased both in number and in degree of atrocity. They include, Lord Crewe declared, both wholesale massacre and wholesale deportations, which were carried out under the guise of enforced evacuation. Similar crimes, he added, had been committed by the Turks against Christians on the Persian border.

The pressure of the Germans and the influence they exercised had been, Lord Crewe continued, "an absolute and unmitigated curse both to the Christian and Moslem population. They have shown a most complete cynical disregard for the country and the people who inhabit it."

Lord Crewe said he regretted that it was impossible to take immediate steps for the suppression of such atrocities, but that those responsible for them would ultimately receive just punishment.

REPORT TURKS SHOT WOMEN AND CHILDREN

PARIS, Aug. 3.—B. Varazdate, a member of the Executive Committee of the Armenian Social Democratic Party, writing to L'Humanita, the Socialist daily, says that the committee has received word to the effect that Turks, after massacring all the males of the population in the region of Bitlis, Turkish Armenia, assembled 9,000 women and children and drove them to the banks of the Tigris, where they shot them and threw the bodies into the river.

These advices have not been substantiated from any other sources.

The Armenian population of Cilicia, in the Turkish Vilayet of Adana, also has been subjected to persecutions, according to the reports of the communities. More than 40,000 persons already are dead and it is feared that the Armenians at Moush and Diarbekr, to Kurdistan also have been massacred.

Twenty members of the Armenian Social Democratic Party, M. Varazdate says, have been publicly hanged in Constantinople after being charged with wishing to found an independent Armenia.

ARMENIAN HORRORS GROW

LONDON, Friday, August 6.—The Daily Chronicle says:

"A tragic episode of the war in the East is the wholesale massacre of the Armenians in the eastern vilayets of Asia Minor by the Turks and Kurds. Regarding the terrible scale of these massacres, greater than any which occurred under Abdul Hamid, there is now no room for doubt, and the statements made on the subject last week by Lord Bryce in the House of Lords were officially corroborated by Lord Crewe.

"In certain cases the Armenians have defended themselves successfully. At the town of Van, for instance, to which Enver Pasha sent his brother-in-law with a commission of extermination, the victims rose after the massacres had begun, barricaded the Armenian quarter, and held out against the Turkish siege for four weeks until relieved by the

advent of the Russian army. But with this and some similar exceptions they have been powerless. Tens and probably hundreds of thousands have been butchered, and great numbers more have been deported by road hundreds of miles to Western Anatolia under conditions amounting to slow extermination.

"The Germans, who are masters of the Central Ottoman Administration, have to their everlasting shame not only permitted, but rather encouraged these horrors. The allied powers have notified the Turkish officials that they will hold them personally responsible, and at this stage they can do no more. There is perhaps room for an effective American protest, though we have not yet heard of one."

The Chronicle concludes by making an appeal to British private charity, citing the following terrible account of ruin and devastation following the Turkish massacres in Northeastern Armenia, telegraphed by Ayvadian, the Archbishop of Van, and Aram, the Governor of Van, to the honorary secretary of the Armenian Red Cross and Refugee Fund:

"Besides Van, the provinces of Chatakh, Moks, Sparkert, Mamertank, and Khizan are saved. The rest are ruined and devastated. Men, women, and children are massacred. Twenty thousand people are homeless. Famine and infectious disease prevail. Many volunteers are sick and wounded. Notwithstanding assistance from the Russian Government and the Armenians in the Caucasus, there is great want of doctors, drugs, ambulances, and food. The situation in Bitlia, Moush, and Diarbekr is terrible. We beg urgently for immediate help."

ARMENIANS ARE SENT TO PERISH IN DESERT

LONDON, Wednesday, Aug. 18.—The Daily News has received from Aneurin Williams, M. P., a copy of a letter from Constantinople, dated July 18, describing the terrible plight of the Armenians in Turkey. The letter says:

"We now know with certainty from a reliable source that the Armenians have been deported in a body from all the towns and villages in Cilicia to the desert regions south of Aleppo. The refugees will have to traverse on foot a distance, requiring marches of from one to two or even more months.

"We learn, besides, that the roads and the Euphrates are strewn with corpses of exiles, and those who survive are doomed to certain death, since they will find neither house, work, nor food in the desert. It is a plan to exterminate the whole Armenian people.

"Courts-martial operate everywhere without cessation. Twelve Armenians were hanged at Caessroa on a charge of having obeyed instructions which they had received from a meeting secretly held at Buchareat by the Troahak and Ilunchak societies. Many have fallen from blows from clubs. Thirteen Armenians were killed in this way at Diarbekr and six at Cassuea. Thirteen others were killed on their way from Chabine-Karahissar to Bluas. The priests of the village of Kurk with their five companions suffered the same fate on the road to Sow-Chehrasvas although they had their hands bound.

"Hundreds of women and young girls and even children groan in prisons. Churches and convents have been pillaged, defiled, and destroyed. The villages around Van and Bitlis have been pillaged and the inhabitants put to the sword."

"At the beginning of this month all the inhabitants of Karahissar were pitilessly massacred, with the exception of a few children."

BURN 1,000 ARMENIANS

LONDON, Friday, Aug. 20.—A Reuter dispatch from Petrograd says:

"Almost unbelievable details of Turkish massacres of Armenians in Bitlis have reached Petrograd.

"In one village 1,000 men, women and children are reported to have been locked in a wooden building and burned to death.

"In another large village only thirty-three persons, it is said, escaped massacre.

"In still another instance, it is asserted, several scores of men and women were tied together by chains and thrown into Lake Van."

TURKS DEPOPULATE TOWNS OF ARMENIA

A traveler who has just arrived in New York from Turkey, where he was long a resident, told The Times yesterday of conditions as he found them in Constantinople, and of the wholesale deportations of Armenians from the interior districts of Asiatic Turkey. For reasons that are valid the narrator does not wish to have his name published, but The Times can vouch for his qualifications as an observer, especially of conditions in the Armenian district.

Leaving Sivas, where he spent some time, he proceeded to Constantinople and thence to Athens, from which port he sailed for New York. When in Constantinople about four weeks ago, he said; the tension was pretty high. In official circles it was maintained that everything was proceeding smoothly for the Turks, but there were many individuals, he said, who expressed discouragement. These put little faith in Germany's motives in aiding Turkey, and some even charged Enver Pasha with having sold out to Germany for money.

1,500,000 ARMENIANS STARVE

The American Armenian Relief Fund Committee has received two letters from Constantinople describing the horrors to which the Armenian Christians in Turkey are being subjected. One letter, dated June 15, says in part:

"The Turkish Government is executing today the plan of scattering the Armenians of the Armenian provinces, profiting from the troubles of the European powers and from the acquiescence of Germany and Austria.

"These people are being removed without any of their goods and chattels, and to places where the climate is totally unsuited to them. They are left without shelter, without food, and without clothing, depending only upon the morsels of bread which the Government will throw before them, a Government which is unable even to feed its own troops.

"It is impossible to read or to hear, without shedding tears, even the meagre details of these deportations. Most of the families have traveled on foot, old men and children have died on the way, young women in child-birth have been left on mountain passes, and at least ten deaths a day are recorded among them even in their place of exile victims of hunger and sickness. It has not been possible as yet to forward any help to Sultanieh, owing to the interdiction of the Government, in spite of the efforts of the American Ambassador, whose philanthropic and generous endeavors in aid of the Armenians are gratefully acknowledged."

ANSWER MORGENTHAU BY HANGING ARMENIANS

LONDON, Thursday, Sept. 16.—A Times correspondent, lately in Salonika, says that all the reports from Turkey are agreed as to the terrible character of the Turkish atrocities against Armenians. It is believed that it is the official intention that this shall be a campaign of extermination, involving the murdering of 800,000 to 1,000,000 persons. Christians can escape murder by embracing Mahomedanism, in which case all the female members of the convert's family of marriageable age—wife, sisters, or children—are distributed around to other Turks, making the reversion to Christianity in future practically impossible.

The American Minister at Constantinople is said to have protested recently against the massacre, in view of the danger to which they exposed the American missionaries. The only response to his protest was the hanging of twenty leading Armenians the next day in the streets of Constantinople.

500,000 ARMENIANS SAID TO HAVE PERISHED

WASHINGTON, Sept. 23.—Charles R. Crane of Chicago, a Director of Roberts College, Constantinople, and James L. Burton of Boston, Foreign Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, visited the State Department today and conferred with Acting Secretary of State Polk and other officials regarding the slaughter of Armenians by Turks and Kurds in Asia Minor. They will attend a meeting of a general committee, to be held in New York within a few days, to devise a plan for appealing to the American people for funds and aid for as many of the unfortunate Armenians as can be helped.

It was learned, in connection with the conferences held here today, that general representations have from time to time been made to the Ottoman Government by Ambassador Morgenthau for humane treatment of Armenians. Despite these representations, the slaughter of Armenians has continued.

The records of the State Department are replete with detailed reports from American Consular officers in Asia Minor, which give harrowing tales of the treatment of the Armenian Christians by the Turks and the Kurds. These reports have not been made public. They indicate that the Turk has undertaken a war of extermination on Armenians, especially those of the Gregorian Church, to which about 90 percent of the Armenians belong. The Turkish Government originally ordered the deportation of all Armenians, but, some time ago, after representations had been made by Ambassador Morgenthau, the Ottoman Government gave assurances that the order would be modified so as not to embrace Catholic and Protestant Armenians.

ARMENIAN WOMEN PUT UP AT AUCTION

The statement made by Count von Bernstorff, the German Ambassador, in a letter to Miran Sevasly of Coston, in which he characterized the reports concerning Turkish atrocities perpetrated against the Armenians as "pure inventions," will be answered in a few days by a number of well-known Americans who are cognizant of the actual situation in Turkey, and who, it is said, will produce absolutely trustworthy evidence and authenticated data to prove, as one of them put it yesterday, that "all Armenia is bloody with atrocities."

The letter of the German Ambassador to Mr. Sevasly was published in The Times of yesterday, and the statements made by Count von Bernstorff created nothing short of indignation in missionary and other circles in which the Armenian situation is at the present time now of vital concern.

"So far as the German Ambassador is concerned, all that I care to say just now," said Professor Samuel T. Dutton, Secretary of the Committee on Armenian Atrocities, yesterday, "is that he has evidently been badly misinformed. I am quite sure that he will be much surprised when he sees the concrete material, all of it thoroughly authenticated, concerning what has happened in Armenia which is in the possession of this committee."

ARMENIAN OFFICIALS MURDERED BY TURKS

LONDON, Sept. 29.—The Cairo correspondent of The Times, in a dispatch dated Sept. 27, says:

Confirmation has reached here of reports of Armenian atrocities of a nauseating and appalling character. Undoubtedly, as on previous occasions, these outrages have been engineered from Stamboul. There is reason to believe that the attack on the Armenians was decided upon on Enver Pasha's return after his repulse in the Caucasus, when he appeared to be infuriated against the Armenians because they had greatly assisted the Russians.

"Talat Bey evidently seized the opportunity to retaliate upon the defenseless colonies in Asia Minor. The formula adopted as a cloak was an order for the expulsion of the Armenians and their deportation to centres in the interior. Resistance or delay in compliance with the order was made the excuse for murder, rape, and other savageries.

"One instance in which leading Armenians were concerned shows the fate awaiting even those who obeyed the order. Vartkes Effendi and Zohrab Effendi, two prominent members of Parliament; Agnuni, one of the chief Dashnakists; Haladjian Effendi, and Pastermedjian Effendi, ex-Ministers of Public Works and Agriculture, were put in a carriage at Urfa for conveyance to Diarbakir, and then were murdered en route, their escort reporting that the murders were the work of brigands. Vartkes was but recently recipient of marks of Talaat Bey's friendship.

"Refugees from Suedia now at Port Said appear to have fought most valiantly. When the deportation order came 4,800 of these took to the hills, where they resisted for seven weeks, one attack of the Turks lasting continuously for twenty-six hours. It is believed that Armenians elsewhere are resisting, but the case of the inland colonies is almost hopeless.

"The nature and scale of the atrocities dwarf anything perpetrated in Belgium or under Abdul Ha mid, whose exploits in this direction now assume an aspect of moderation compared with those of the present Governors of Turkey. Talaat Bay, when ordering the deportations, said:

"'After this, for fifty years there will not be an Armenian question.'"

SAYS EXTINCTION MENACES ARMENIA

Dr. M. Simbad Gabriel, President of the Armenian General Progressive Association in the United States told a Times reporter last night that no American could possibly conceive of the atrocities which the Turks had perpetrated on the Christian Armenians. He said that from correspondence he

had received from Nubar Pasha, the diplomatic representative in Paris of the Catholicos or head of the Armenian church, he estimated the number of Armenians put to death as more than 450,000, while 600,000 others had been driven from their homes to wander among the villages of Asia Minor, all these out of a population of 1,500,000.

"We in America can't begin to realize the extent of this reign of terror," said Dr. Gabriel, "because Armenians in Turkey are not allowed to write, nor even to converse with each other of what they are undergoing at the hands of the Turks. Nubar Pasha writes that he has been informed by the Catholicos and also by prominent Armenians in Constantinople, who bind him by the most solemn oaths not to reveal their names, of some of the horrible deeds which have been perpetrated by the Moslems on the Armenians."

TALES OF ARMENIAN HORRORS CONFIRMED

Professor Samuel Train Dutton, Secretary of the Committee on Armenian Atrocities, made public yesterday a preliminary statement of the committee outlining the result of its investigation of the terrible conditions existing among the Armenians. The committee says that the reports concerning the massacre, torture, and other maltreatment of Armenians of all-ages abundantly are confirmed by its investigation.

Other members of the committee besides Professor Dutton are Cleveland H. Dodge, Arthur Curtiss James, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, John R. Mott, Frank Mason North, James L. Barton, William Sloane, D. Stuart Dodge, and others.

The statement issued by the committee yesterday is as follows:

"A sub-committee has thoroughly investigated the evidence and has just made report to the full committee confirming in every particular the statement recently made by Viscount Bryce regarding the imprisonment, torture, murder, massacre, and exile into the deserts of Northern Arabia of defenseless and innocent Armenians, including decrepit men, women and children, and their forcible conversion to Islam.

"Written testimonies of eyewitnesses whose names are known to the committee, but which obviously cannot now be made public, have been examined with utmost care. This testimony covers hundreds of pages, and the character and position of the authors and the positiveness of utterances carry absolute conviction.

GOVERNMENT SENDS PLEA FOR ARMENIA

WASHINGTON, Oct. 4.—Further representations have been made to the Ottoman Government by the Government of the United States regarding the Armenian atrocities.

Secretary of State Lansing tonight sent to Ambassador Morgenthau at Constantinople a message voicing the interest of the American people in the Armenian situation, and urging that steps be taken by the Turkish Government for the protection and humane treatment of the Armenians.

The message did not take the form of a protest from the Government of the United States, but directed Mr. Morgenthau to inform the Ottoman Government that the atrocities inflicted upon the Armenian Christians had aroused strong sentiment among the American people, and that a continuation of these atrocities would tend to jeopardize the good feeling of the people of the United States toward the people of Turkey.

Secretary Lansing said today that no representations had been made to Germany regarding the treatment of the Armenians by the Turks. It was learned, however, that Ambassador Morgenthau had reported that the German Embassy at Constantinople had filed a protest on this subject with the Turkish Foreign Office. An announcement some time ago was to the effect that the State Department had asked Count von Bernstorff, the German Ambassador here, to bring the matter to the attention of his Foreign Office.

800,000 ARMENIANS COUNTED DESTROYED

LONDON, Thursday, Oct. 7.—The Daily Chronicle's Parliamentary correspondent in the House of Lords says:

"This afternoon Lord Bryce gave a heart-piercing account of the circumstances under which the Armenian people are being exterminated as a result of an absolutely premeditated policy elaborately pursued by the gang now in control of Turkey. He computes that since May last 800,000 Armenians, men, women, and children, have been slain in cold blood in Asia Minor.

"The House of Lords is a very unemotional assembly, but it was thrilled in every fibre at the story of the horrors compared to which even the atrocities of Abdul Hamid pale. As Lord Bryce truly said, there is not a case in history since the days of Tamerlane where a crime so hideous and on so gigantic a scale has been recorded. An ex-Sultan of Turkey is credited with saying that 'the only way to get rid of the Armenian question is to get rid of the Armenian.'"

"That horrible policy has," Lord Bryce said, "been carried out far more thoroughly by the present Turkish Government than it ever was by Abdul Hamid." The Armenian nation is not yet quite extinct; forlorn remnants have found refuge in the Caucasian provinces; some managed to reach Egypt; a few ill-armed, half-starved bands; are bravely defending themselves from would-be assassins in the mountains of Sassun and Cilicia.

SPARE ARMENIANS, POPE ASKS SULTAN

ROME, Oct. 10.—Mgr. Dolci, the Apostolic Delegate at Constantinople, having reported to the Holy See on the sufferings of the Armenians, Pope Benedict has written an autograph letter to the Sultan of Turkey interceding for the unfortunate people.

BERLIN, Oct. 10, (by Wireless to Tucker-ton, N.J.).—"The Cologne Gazette refers to the accusations of Lord Cromer and the Marquis of Crews in the House of Lords that German Consular officials encouraged the Turkish population to attack Armenians," says the Overseas News Agency. "The newspaper states that the purpose of these unfounded assertions is easy to comprehend. England wishes to divert the attention of neutrals from the violation of Greek neutrality, and, since the Belgian question is no longer novel enough, turns to new accusations."

MASSACRES RENEWED, MORGENTHAU REPORTS

WASHINGTON, Oct. 12.—Armenian massacres in Asiatic Turkey have been renewed with vigor since Bulgaria's practical entrance into the war as Turkey's ally. This information reached the State Department today from Ambassador Morgenthau, who stated that the majority of the Armenians in Asiatic Turkey had been killed.

Although representations were made by this Government, some time ago, warning

Turkey that further atrocities against the Armenians would alienate the sympathies of the American people, no answer has been received.

Earlier representations were met with two concessions, promising that those Armenians who wished to leave the country would be permitted to do so unharmed, and further that Protestant Armenians would be spared. Information recently reaching this country, however, indicates that these conditions have not been strictly adhered to. From one quarter it was asserted that "they were rescinded the next day."

Although \$100,000 from private subscriptions has been placed at Ambassador Morgenthau's disposal, for distribution among the Armenian refugees now banished to desert towns, no arrangements have been made for bringing Armenians to this country, as was originally planned, except where friends or relatives send for them. Those Armenians who were spared are now gathered in the country between the Tigres and Euphrates Rivers.

TURKISH OFFICIAL DENIES ATROCITIES

Djelal Munif Bey, the Turkish Consul General in New York, in an official statement to the Times yesterday declared the report made public a week ago last Sunday by the American Committee on Armenian Atrocities, which asserted that not in the one thousand years just ended had a people suffered such terrible outrages as are those the Turks are perpetrating upon the Armenians, to be a fabrication. The report described the atrocities as being officially sanctioned from Constantinople, and it was stated that the situation was one involving an attempt to wipe out an entire race.

Among the men who signed the report were Bishop David H. Greer, Cleveland H. Dodge, Oscar S. Straus, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, the Rev. Dr. James L. Barton, William Sloane, Professor Samuel P. Dutton, Charles R. Crane, and Arthur Curtiss James. Cardinal Gibbons has, since the report was issued, accepted membership on the committee.

The committee, in a foreword to the report, stated that it vouched for its truthfulness, and added that "the movement against the Armenians forms part of a concerted movement against all non-Turkish and missionary and progressive elements, including the Zionists."

The Times yesterday asked Djelal Bey, as the highest Turkish official in New York, if he, as the representative of the Ottoman Government, had any reply to make to the charges made by the Armenian Atrocities Committee.

ONLY 200,000 ARMENIANS NOW LEFT IN TURKEY

TIFLIS, TRANSCAUCASIA, Oct. 19 (via Petrograd and London, Oct. 21).—The estimate is made by the Armenian newspaper Mshak that of the 1,200,000 Armenian inhabitants of Turkey before the war there remain not more than 200,000. This residue, the Mshak says, may disappear before the end of the war, on account of the Turkish policy of extermination.

The figures of the Mshak are based on the estimate of the Armenian Patriarch at Constantinople that 850,000 Armenians have been killed or enslaved by the Turks. In addition to which 200,000 Armenians are believed to have fled to Russia.

GERMANY SAYS SHE CANNOT STOP TURKS

WASHINGTON, Oct. 22.—Confidential advices received today by the State Department said the German Government had officially made efforts to alleviate alleged atrocities upon Armenians in Turkey, but that Turkish officials apparently displayed lack of interest in such endeavors.

Representations were made by the United States through Ambassador Morgenthau at Constantinople some time ago, warning Turkey that continued persecution of Armenians would alienate the friendship of the American people. A number of dispatches on the subject have been received from Mr. Morgenthau, but there has been no announcement of a definite answer from the Ottoman Government.

SLAY ALL ARMENIANS IN CITY OF KERASUNT

LONDON, Tuesday, Oct. 28.—A dispatch to the Daily Mail from Odessa says:

"The Turks have massacred the entire Armenian population of Kerasunt, on the Black Sea."

Kerasunt is a seaport in Asiatic Turkey, about seventy miles west of Trebizond. It is situated on a rocky promontory with a spacious bay on the east side. The heights surrounding are covered with luxurious vegetation. The population of Kerasunt is about 24,000.

LONDON, Oct. 25.—An eyewitness story of Armenian atrocities, given to the British staff at the Dardanelles by an Armenian prisoner who was serving in the Turkish Army, is sent by the Reuter correspondent with the Dardanelles fleet. This Armenian says the declaration of martial law at Zile included the confiscation of all Armenian property.

He describes how women were tied to the tails of ox carts and exposed to hunger and rough weather until they accepted conversion to Islam or death; how mothers were bayoneted before the eyes of their children, and how Armenian girls were distributed as chattels among civil and military officials.

The prisoner says that as a soldier he was compelled to assist in many massacres, being on one occasion a member of a party of forty soldiers which superintended the death of 800 Armenians. His account closes as follows:

"There is reason to believe that German advisers of the Turks have urged upon them the undesirability of allowing a large alien and presumably unfriendly population to inhabit ports which lie open to Russian attack."

AID FOR ARMENIANS BLOCKED BY TURKEY

The American Committee on Armenian Atrocities, among the members of which are Cardinal Gibbons, Cleveland H. Dodge, Bishop David H. Greer, Oscar S. Straus, Professor Samuel T. Dutton, Charles R. Crane, and many other prominent citizens, issued a statement yesterday in which it was said that authentic reports from Turkey proved that the war of extermination being waged by the Turks against the Armenians was so terrible that when all the facts were known the world would realize that what had been done was "the greatest, most pathetic, and most arbitrary tragedy in history."

Attempts to furnish food to the Armenians, ordered deported to distant parts of the empire were blocked by the Turkish authorities, the committee said, the Turkish officials stating that "they wished nothing to be done that would prolong their lives."

In the statement the committee makes public a report received a few days ago from an official representative of one of the neutral powers, who, reporting on conditions in one of the Armenian camps, says:

"I have verified their encampment and a more pitiable sight cannot be imagined. They are, almost without exception, ragged, hungry and sick. This is not surprising in view of the fact that they have been on the road for nearly two months, with no change of clothing, no chance to bathe, no shelter, and little to eat. I watched them one time when their food was brought. Wild animals could not be worse. They rushed upon the guards who carried the food and the guards beat them back with clubs, hitting hard enough to kill sometimes. To watch them one could hardly believe these people to be human beings. As one walks through the camp, mothers offer their children and beg you to take them. In fact, the Turks have been taking their choice of these children and girls, for slaves or worse. There are very few men among them as most of the men were killed on the road. Women and children were also killed. The entire movement seems to be the most thoroughly organized and effective massacre this country has ever seen."

GERMANY PROTESTED ARMENIAN MASSACRES

BOSTON, Dec. 22.—The German Government on Aug. 9 last filed at Constantinople a protest against the Turkish treatment of Armenians, according to Dr. James L. Barton, Chairman of the National Committee for Armenian and Serbian Relief, who today made public the text of the protest.

In a statement quoting the official statement transmitted by the German Embassy at Constantinople, Dr. Barton, speaking for the committee, called attention to the fact that Count Ernest von Reventlow, the German naval expert, in a recent statement, published in the Tages Zeitung in Germany and cabled to the United States, strongly defended Turkey's massacre of the Armenians on the basis of military necessity.

"One wonders," Dr. Barton added, "whether von Reventlow knows that throughout the length and breadth of the Turkish Empire, after the men (who only were capable of revolution, but who, according to every known evidence did not revolt) had nearly all been disposed of, the attack fell upon the widows and orphans, who were driven from their homes by hundreds of thousands at the point of the bayonet."

"It is possible that von Reventlow knows that fully one-half of these refugees miserably perished from violence, exposure and starvation. He must be ignorant of the sickening reports made by many eyewitnesses—American, Italian, British, German—civilian and official, who tell of seeing these helpless inoffensive women and girls brained because they clamored for food or forced into Islam because perchance they were comely, of women throwing their babies into rivers or over precipices to save them from the impending horror of continuing existence."

AMERICANS' DEATHS LAID TO THE TURKS

The strain and shock of the tragedies that the war has brought to Turkey during the last year is responsible for the deaths of five of the American missionaries on duty in the Turkish Embassy since the first of last May, the period covered by the Turkish campaign against the Armenians, according to the annual report of the Rev. Dr. James L. Barton, the foreign secretary of the Board

of Commissioners of Foreign Missions, made public here yesterday.

The missionaries whose deaths are attributed to the terrible conditions in Turkey were Mrs. Mary E. Barnum, died at Harpoot, May 9, after fifty-six years of service in Turkey; Mrs. Charlotte E. Ely, died at Bitlis, July 11, after forty-seven years continuous service; the Rev. George P. Knapp, died at Diarbekr, Aug. 10, after twenty-five years service at Harpoot and at Bitlis; Mrs. Martha W. Reynolds, wife of the Rev. Dr. George C. Reynolds, died Aug. 27, from injuries received while in flight from Van to Tiflis, Russia, and Mrs. Elizabeth Ussher, died of typhus fever at Van, July 14, after sixteen years of service.

The report goes into the war situation in detail. Among the hundreds of thousands of Armenians and other Christians who perished in Turkey, Dr. Barton states, were "professors and teachers in our schools, pastors and preachers, pupils, and all other classes," every one of whom he adds, "miserably perished at home, or have died of exposure upon the road toward northern Arabia or elsewhere where vast multitudes have been exiled."

"Probably in all history," Dr. Barton continues, "two hundred missionaries have never been called on to pass through more terrible experiences than have our missionaries in Turkey during the last nine or ten months, and the end is not yet."

Referring to the treatment of Armenians by the Turkish authorities, Dr. Barton says that when Harpoot was made a military centre several of the buildings of Euphrates College were voluntarily turned over to the Turkish military authorities. A large dormitory was not and the American Consul sealed the door with the official seal of the United States.

MILLION ARMENIANS KILLED OR IN EXILE

In a statement issued yesterday from the offices of the American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief at 70 Fifth Avenue, further atrocities committed by Turks upon Armenian Christians were detailed and additional evidence was given to support Lord Bryce's assertion that the massacres are the result of a deliberate plan of the Turkish Government to "get rid of the Armenian question," as Abdul Hamid once said, by getting "rid of the Armenians."

Professor Samuel T. Dutton, Secretary of the committee, said:

"According to all of the best evidence which the American committee has received, it is probably well within the truth to say that of the 2,000,000 Armenians in Turkey a year ago, at least 1,000,000 have been killed or forced into Islam, or compelled to flee the country, or have died upon the way to exile, or are now upon the road to the deserts of Northern Arabia, or are already there. The number of victims is constantly increasing. Surely there can be no greater need of immediate help, even in these troublous times, than the desperate need of the Armenian refugees. The American committee has already done much in collecting and sending funds, as has also the English committees, but there is still the direct need of generous contributions. All contributions should be sent to Charles R. Crane, Treasurer, 70 Fifth Avenue."

SULTAN SEARCHING OUT AUTHORS OF KILLINGS

LONDON, Dec. 6.—The London newspapers today printed an interview with Mohammed VI, the Turkish Sultan, obtained by a British correspondent in Constantinople, who describes that ruler as a very different personality from his two brothers who preceded him on the throne.

Mohammed VI, says the correspondent, gives one the impression of possessing a strong character and considerable intellectual force. He is tall and slender, and his appearance suggests that of a university professor.

In talking with the correspondent the Sultan condemned the unwisdom and lack of foresight which brought Turkey into the war and led her to the calamity which had befallen her. He declared that if he had been Sultan this would never have happened.

The ruler expressed great sorrow at the treatment of the Armenians by "certain political committees of Turkey," and added:

"Such misdeeds and the mutual slaughter of sons of the same fatherland have broken my heart. I ordered an inquiry as soon as I came to the throne so that the tormentors might be severely punished, but various factors prevented my orders from being promptly carried out. The matter is now being thoroughly investigated. Justice will soon be done and we will never have a repetition of these ugly events."

The Sultan asked the interviewer to publish the following from him:

"The great majority of the nation is entirely innocent of the misdeeds attributed to it. Only a limited number of persons are responsible."

SAW ARMENIANS DROWNED IN GROUPS

PORTLAND, Me., Feb. 1.—The young American woman who Abram I. Elkus, former American Ambassador to Turkey, says is the only living eyewitness to the atrocities of the Turks against the Armenians, excepting the Turks themselves, was found in this city today by newspaper men. She is Mrs. George Dar Arsanian of 27 Washington Avenue, and through the assistance of Mr. Elkus and ex-Ambassador James W. Gerard, she escaped from Turkey and eventually returned to America.

Her first husband, Robert Agasarian, an Armenian by birth, but a naturalized American citizen and resident of this country for twenty years was murdered, she says, by the Turks along with hundreds of others, and her little son was drowned in a river near the town of Chmeshgasak, Turkey.

TURKS HANG KEMAL BEY FOR ARMENIAN MASSACRES

CONSTANTINOPLE, April 12.—Kemal Bey, Governor of Diarbekir, has been publicly hanged in Bayazid Square in Stamboul, in the presence of the Military Governor of Constantinople and other high officials. Kemal Bey was sentenced to death as one of those responsible for the Armenian deportations and massacres in the Yozghad district.

The former commander of the gendarmery in Yozghad was sentenced to fifteen years imprisonment in the fortress.

These sentences were confirmed by an imperial irade.

The trial of those responsible for the Armenian massacres by the Turks began early in February at Constantinople. The prosecutor declared that it was necessary to punish the authors of the massacres, which

had filled the whole world with a feeling of horror.

Kemal Bey was former Turkish Minister of Food.

ARMENIAN GIRLS TELL OF MASSACRES

Personal narratives told by Christian women and girls of Armenia, who were deported from their homes to virtual captivity or slavery in the camps of the Turks, Circassians and Arabs, or were held captives in Turkish harems in Asia Minor, have been received by the American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief. A statement issued by the Committee says that the women whose stories are now made public, were released by their masters or rescued by allied troops.

"After the signing of the armistice," says the Committee's statement, "many of the Turks, believing that by so doing they could escape punishment, turned the women—many of them with babies—into the streets." Cable dispatches to the Committee have reported that numbers of these women were wandering about the country, crazed by starvation and exposure. As fast as possible they are being gathered up by the Committee's relief workers and placed in homes established for their care. A late telegram said that fifteen such homes have been established in Asia Minor.

Stories of Armenian victims of Turkish atrocity were obtained by Dr. Loyal I. Wirt, member of an expedition sent to Turkey by the Committee. They were taken down as related by Dr. W. A. Kennedy, Field Director of the Lord Mayor's Relief Fund of London. Dr. Kennedy assured Dr. Wirt that he personally reread the affidavits to the narrators and they signed them in his presence.

SOVIET ARMENIAN HISTORIAN COMMENTS—THE DISTORTION OF HISTORY CONTINUES (By Prof. John G. Giragosian)

In recent times, Prof. John Giragosian, a historian specializing in the period of contemporary Armenian history that covers the tragic events of World War I, and who is also the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Soviet Armenia, has frequently written about present efforts on the part of Turkey to distort historical facts by presenting the Ottoman Turkish massacres of Armenians as a simple uprising by Armenians that resulted in much killing on both sides.

Prof. Giragosian is the author of many books about this period and is viewed as an authority on the subject. While Soviet Armenian leaders have discounted claims that the series of articles by Prof. Giragosian reflects a new policy on the part of the Soviet Union toward Turkey, and particularly toward the Turkish-Armenian issue, there is reason to believe that these articles are not coincidental to the surge of Armenian terrorism directed at Turkish diplomats and targets throughout Europe, the United States and Canada.

Below is Part I of the English translation of one of the most recent essays written by Prof. Giragosian. Part II will be published in the next issue of the Armenian Reporter. The translation was done by Edward K. Boghosian, editor of this paper.

In 1980 published in New York City was a volume entitled Documentary History of the Massacres of Armenians in Yozghad authored by Krieger. Featured in this volume are remarkable documents and evidence collected from official Turkish sources and newspapers in the period 1918-1919. Based on this material, we note that as early as

1918; an investigative committee attached to the Turkish government was created with a decree issued by the Sultan, which was commissioned to compile all official documents related to the massacres of the Armenians. Heading this commission was Mazhar Bey, the former governor of the district of Ankara, who was removed from office in 1915 for his refusal to carry out orders received from Talaat Pasha for the deportation of Armenians. Through a series of questionnaires addressed to various districts of the country, Mazhar Bey managed to collect a huge quantity of official and special testimony, which he subsequently submitted to the Military Tribunal.

On December 12, 1918, Jemal Bey, the district governor of Yozghad, offered detailed testimony revealing important information on the criminal role of some high government officials. For instance, he told how a police chief, named Tewfic Bey, organized marauding teams of irregulars who were set on Armenians. After the dismissal of Jemal Bey, when Kemal Bey visited Yozghad, he immediately embarked on the task of carrying out plans for the annihilation of Armenians.

Halide Edip Hanoum, a prominent Turkish poetess, and an activist in public and political life, signed a statement that appeared in the October 21, 1918 issue of Vaket in which she said: "In those days when we were strong, we attempted to destroy the Christians in general and Armenians in particular through methods reminiscent of the Middle Ages. . . . We are presently living the darkest and the saddest days of our national life. Both the United States and Great Britain look upon us as a country which has gone so far as to attempt to destroy its own nationals and sons. The present government asserts that we should arrange for the return of Armenians to their homes." She did not believe that such a plan could be successfully carried out as she little trusted the ability of local authorities. Instead she was raising the possibility of forming a joint commission consisting of Turks, Armenians and Americans who sought justice. Two months later, Halide Edib, in an article appearing in Yeni Gun, was charging the Young Turks party and the government with responsibility for the crimes committed against the Armenian people, and drawing the conclusion that "Turks had provided the evidence that they could not from a civilized government."

Following the armistice, the massacres of the Armenians became the most important issue that kept the Ottoman Parliament busy. Comments offered and discussions of the issue were subsequently printed in Takvieme Vakayeen, the official gazette of the military tribunal and in other publications. In the 1919-1920 issues of Takvieme Vakayeen, printed were the minutes of the deliberations at the Tribunal, while other publications offered commentaries about specific issues and important points.

Hafez Mehmed Bey, the deputy from the Drabizond district, offered documentary evidence to prove that the massacres of the Armenians had been organized by the government of the Young Turks party and that was carried out by the units of bandits and thugs operating as "Teshkilate Makhsoosie." Demands were made during these discussions in the Parliament that not only those who conspire to stage the assassinations or massacres. "Such persons must be brought to trial in lower courts," has been registered in the minutes of the Parliament, and "the issue is raised to condemn those

crimes which have been committed by the unruly crowds with the explicit approval and cooperation of government officials." Some were even accusing the Turkish Parliament of complicity in the mischief committed. It is proper to remind readers that following the collapse of the Talaat government, October 7, 1918, major reshuffling within the high levels of the governing body took place. In general, and starting with October 1918, and following the November 7th resignation of the Young Turk government, the criticism of the government, reassessments and accusations turned into a major preoccupation in the Turkish press. The Armenian issue, the deportation and the annihilation of Western Armenians, the various aspects of the role played by Armenians in the Ottoman Empire were widely discussed. Jelal Bey, the governor of Konya, who first served as governor of Aleppo, in articles that appeared in the *Vaket* newspaper, discussed at length details about the deportation of Armenians and his stand regarding these. "If all our enemies in the world had joined together against us and wanted to hurt us in a manner without any parallel, they could not do so. . . . Armenians held one quarter of the country's wealth," he wrote, "they controlled almost half of the country's trade and manufacturing. Exterminating Armenians was tantamount to destroying the empire itself, a loss that could not be replaced in centuries to come." Jelal Bey did not conceal his views either from the government or from members of the Parliament. Unfortunately few people paid any attention to his pleas.

AN OPEN ADMISSION

The *Renaissance* newspaper, in its issue of December 18, 1918, published the full text of the interview granted by Prince Abdul Mejid, the heir to the throne, to the *British Morning Post*. In this interview, the heir to the Ottoman throne did not conceal the fact that "the massacres were the work of Talaat and Enver," and that "if Germany so chose, she could have prevented the massacres from taking place," and other similar comments. The prince also revealed that Enver had not even attempted to cover up the fact that there were "implicit decisions" relative to the massacres. He was quoted as saying that he had pleaded with the Sultan to intervene in the matter, yet the Sultan had failed to heed his pleas.

New evidence was continually offered in the press and names of the guilty were continually being exposed. The Turkish *Sabah* paper featured an open letter addressed to Pirizad Ibrahim Bey, the former minister of justice, which contained many revealing queries. "Were you not in favor of the decisions made at the headquarters of the top leaders of the Young Turks when you chose to release from detention a host of tough criminals for the sole purpose of expelling Armenians from their homes despite their complete innocence . . . you let them be ruthlessly exterminated. . . . Was it not you who rejoiced over the massacres of the Armenians, which were being carried out with blows from axes, hatchets and picks?"

These are facts that cannot be ignored in order to cover up the truth. This is precisely how those who distort history are presently acting.

In the deliberations of the special Military Tribunal set up in December of 1918 by Sultan Mehmet VI Vahid Eddin, through an imperial edict, to try those responsible for the massacres of the Armenians, charges were based on the contents of official documents from the government of Young Turks

and other evidence provided by special testimony. This evidence was later published, in addition to the *Takvim e Vakal* official gazette, in a number of other publications. The French language *Renaissance* paper that was published in Istanbul has devoted considerable space to this evidence.

Let Turkish diplomats and ambassadors such as Elekdagh, Bulak and their other colleagues, if they so choose, become acquainted with these articles that appeared in the *Renaissance*.

When, on December 21, 1918, issues related to the offenses committed by leaders of the Young Turk party were being discussed in the Turkish Parliament, addressing the issue of the massacres of the Armenians, Mustafa Arif Bey, then the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey, declared: "Now that atrocities committed against Armenians have come to the surface, mankind views these atrocities with disgust. The country was turned over to us as if it were one huge slaughter house."

At the end of 1918 and the beginning of 1919, Ali Kemal, the editor-in-chief of the Istanbul based *Sabah* paper and Yunus Nadi, the chief editor of *Yenbi Gun*, in a series of editorial comments, focused on the necessity of revealing the names of those who were responsible for the massacres of the Armenians and the need to set the stage to bring such people to trial. "The whole world is aware of the reality that these massacres were executed by the orders of the Central Committee (the reference is about the *Ittihad* party). The orders were transmitted through special envoys and were carried out under their own supervision through an army of thugs. Is it not a service to the Turks and to the cause of Turkey, the disclosure of this fact?" editor Ali Kemal asked. "Would anyone wish us to refrain from bringing this out so that we too will fall prey to the same accusations?"

The Turkish *Istiklal* newspaper conceded that World War I triggered a spirit of immorality and animal passion among Turks. To deny the cold truth is to deny the sunrises (*Renaissance*, No. 173, June 22, 1919).

When, on November 4, 1918, the Ottoman Parliament was discussing the deportation of Armenians and issues related to the massacres, Fuad Bey, a member of the Parliament, directed numerous charges at the Young Turks, after accusing their leaders of turning Turkey into "a theater for crime."

We do not doubt that if asked, the archives kept in Istanbul and Ankara would willingly provide these Turkish historians copies of the issues of *Renaissance*, *Tasvire Evkear* and other publications. Let these historians glance through the pages, study the history of their own country and no longer see the need to lie.

The Turkish Military Tribunal levelled two charges at the offenders of the Young Turk movement: 1. The entry of Turkey in World Wars I and II; 2. The extermination of the Armenian people. The Tribunal sentenced to death a number of governors and cabinet ministers. On April 8, 1919, sentenced to death were Kemal Bey, Governor of Yozgad, followed by the sentencing to death on May 22 of Jemal Azmi Bey, governor of Trabizond and in absentia, of Naim Bey, the secretary general of the *Ittihad* party in that city. Similarly on July 5, 1919, death sentences were announced for Enver, Talaat, Jemal and other leaders who had managed to escape from the country.

When the Military Tribunal announced its first death sentence, the spokesman for the Sublime Port and the Sultan's Palace, in

an interview with *Alemtar* daily, described the nature of actions against Armenians: "Let us not attribute to Armenians any offense. Let us not forget that the world is not stupid." It appears that this true assessment offered some 65 years ago, was made for those Turks of the present period who distort history.

The *Alemtar* newspaper was equalling the sentencing of Ali Kemal Bey with the condemnation of the Turkish people, and asserted that "our only means of salvation was to cry out loud to the civilized world that we are determined to bring to just and open trial all offenders. If the square at Bayazid fails to witness the gallows of those who are hung, then Paris (where the 1919 Peace Conference was held) would become the site of our condemnation as a people and a country." *Alemtar* continued: "We as Turks, are charged with a crime and are infected with an incurable disease, which is more horrible than the plague. This is precisely why we set up a special military tribunal in order to punish the offenders so due justice is carried out." (*Renaissance*, No. 128, January 5, 1919).

It was not accidental that in an official message to the Paris Peace Conference, Damad Ferid Pasha, the Prime Minister of the Turkish government, conceded the following statement: "During the War, the civilized world was touched and shaken when it learned about those crimes committed by Turks. I cannot even think of distorting these crimes, crimes that horrify man's conscience. More so, I cannot minimize the scope of the guilt of those offenders who were responsible for this tragedy. Based on documentary evidence, I intend to tell the world who were the real responsables for these horrible crimes."

Such is the evidence of history. It demands respect. It appears that *Turktche Stamboul* newspaper in 1919 wrote about those official personalities of the present who do not seem to respect the evidences and said: "Claims made by us that Armenians were the aggressors in Van and we then had to resort to revengeful actions in Anadolou, can only satisfy those who are directed by 'sentiments' and do not wish to accept the scientific and true explanations. Such a position will never defend our cause in the face of public opinion of Europe and the United States."

Yes, these indeed are the facts of history, Mr. Politician and Mr. Diplomat. And those who presently strive to distort these facts and vindicate those who committed the genocide, are double offenders and deserve the same fate as their predecessors.

The onslaught by Turkey to distort history goes on without interruption. In recent times, these efforts have assumed major proportions and strange forms. The Turkish press is full of anti-Armenian fabrications. Official Turkish circles appear to have engaged in a major effort to force their distortions of history relative to the Armenian genocide and the Turkish massacres of Armenians upon the entire world and particularly on the news media in the United States, the western world and in Europe. Turkish diplomats assigned to these countries have engaged in feverish activities along these lines and have expended considerable sums to "buy out" leading newspapers in order to publish ridiculous lies that have been proven wrong many times over. According to the claims made, rather than being the victims, Armenians were the "aggressors." It appears that these are efforts on the part of a group of liars who are con-

vinced that by repeating lies, people will sooner or later believe them. Thus we are witness to the promotion of another lie, one even worse than the original lies presented. Yet, few are those who believe in these lies. In the March 15th issue of the Los Angeles Times, Nicholas Loudington, a writer, stated, "official Turkish representatives are fearful that a public and candid recognition of historical facts may lead to suggestion of compensations."

The New York Times, in its issue of April 23, 1983, published an essay written by G. Meyer on the tragedy that struck western Armenians. His presentation, in general, appears to be a factual representation of events of that period. The large Armenian community in Turkey in 1915 emerged as the first victim of genocide in the 20th century. This awful measure caused the deportation and massacre of over a million and a half Armenians, noted Mr. Meyer, who condemned the present Turkish government for its consistent failure to acknowledge its responsibility. This refusal is viewed as a "loss of memory."

Further, the New York Times, in its issue on May 5, 1983, published a letter written by Sukru Elekdagh, Turkey's Ambassador in Washington, D.C. This letter, one might say, either offered false claims or repeated old claims. Ambassador Elekdagh appears to be unhappy over the trials in 1919 by Turkish military tribunals of the Young Turks, who were guilty. According to the ambassador, Armenian insurgents, allied with Russia, aimed at creating an "Armenian State" on Turkish territory. He also attempts to deny claims made by G. Meyer relative to the Armenian population of Ottoman Turkey which was placed at 2,300,000, and rather attempted to claim that the number was merely 1,300,000. That the ambassador is not right, is known to everyone, particularly those who are familiar with history and to fundamental historical sources. However, let us for a moment question the Turkish diplomat as to what happened to that number of people. Wouldn't that number, within the period of six decades, have tripled or even quadrupled? The Turkish ambassador ridicules events portrayed in Werfel's novel, *Forty Days of Musa Dagh*, discounting it as far from authoritative. In the view of Ambassador Elekdagh, decrees issued by the Ottoman government for the "relocation" of Armenians had been carried out "under the best of conditions for the Armenians." This, of course, is still another unique example of that impudent expression of the contemporary Turkish view about the annihilation of the Armenian people. The Ambassador is presently one of the active servants of anti-Soviet, anti-Russian policies of the United States government. He makes reference to an article written by one John Dewey that appeared in the *New Republic* which claimed that "Armenians, acting treacherously, were turning over to Russian invaders, Turkish cities and towns." Both the American writer, and the Turkish ambassador are assessing the development of historical facts through the anti-Soviet prism of U.S. imperialism and NATO. These people would be wise if they spent some time going through the National Archives in Washington, D.C., looking through the thousands of proofs that establish historical truth.

In its issue of May 2, the *Parisian daily*, *Le Monde* devoted almost a whole page to the issue of the Genocide of Western Armenians. This paper first noted the views of Mr. Claude Cheysson, Minister of Foreign Af-

fairs of France, who was quoted as saying, "Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire became the subjects of a Genocide, an act that France condemns. The evidence is there and always will be and no one has the right to either distort it or to encourage people to forget. The government of France regrets the position adopted by Turkey which continues to adamantly view these developments as an effort to crush an uprising instigated by Russian military advances." The French Minister also offers the view that the present government of Turkey should not feel responsible for the tragedy that struck the Armenian people some 60 years ago.

MORE FALSEHOODS BY THE TURKS

On the same page, *Le Monde* featured an article by Adnan Bulak, Turkey's ambassador in France, under the general heading of "Turkish View," and with the title "In the Service of Outside Interests." In this article, the Turkish ambassador emerges in the role of a defense attorney as he tries to conceal the cannibalism of the Young Turks. He discusses the necessity for the relocation of Armenians from the border areas and their resettlement in Syria, yet conveniently forgets to let his French readers know that Adnan Bulak and Brousa, Ankara and Malatia, Kharpert, Kayseri, Arapkir and Van were not situated in the border areas, yet were subjected to destructive blows. There is no need to focus on his claims which have no sound basis. No one expects anything more than that from the spokesmen of the present military junta. Isn't it true that, as stated in the May, 1983 issue of *Vie Ouvriere*, a French publication, that "the present repression of Kurds in certain areas is tantamount to another genocide?"

These ambassadors and their cohorts must be reminded that in 1918, 1919, coverage and evidence appearing in Turkish and American newspapers clearly recognizes the true history of the events of the tragic past.

As early as September 1916, at the convention held in Constantinople by the Ittihad party, discussed were the abuses by certain officials relative to the deportation of Armenians. Talaat and his associates attempted to portray everything in light of the Armenians' pro-Russian stance, the uprising against the central government and their cooperation with the Russian armies. Despite these justifications, the scope of the crime was so overwhelming, and its echo to the outside world so far-reaching that the Convention chose to note the excesses committed against Armenians, and decided to immediately dispatch investigative committees to those areas. The decision was followed by the publication, prompted by Talaat Pasha, of a pamphlet containing nothing but falsehoods and called "The Truth of the Armenian Revolutionary Movement and the Measures Taken by the Government, 1916." The purpose of the publication of this booklet served only to justify the actions of the government. Yet, at the end of 1918, soon after the defeat in World War I of the Ottoman Empire, incriminating documents surfaced right in Constantinople, in the Turkish Parliament that had remained subservient to the military machine of the Young Turks, and in the Turkish press, all of which shed light on the dark phases of the crime committed. Subsequently, certain leaders of the Young Turks movement were brought to trial at military tribunals. The newspapers of November and December of 1918 were full of articles which provided a wealth of evidence aimed at bringing out the whole truth. Pub-

lished in the Turkish press were the texts of anti-Armenian decrees and directives issued by Talaat, Behaeddin Shakir, Nazim. One of these clearly said: "Follow to the 'T' the orders given to you for the massacres of the Armenians." (*Jamanak*, November 12, 1918). In the same issue of the paper also quoted an poem that had been presented as an order to the governors. This is what it said:

Let no weapon fire,
Let no soldier do
Let no Armenian be left
Adults be butchered
Young maidens be selected
Deport the remaining.

Mr. LEVIN, Mr. President, I am also sorry to report that the Senate's Armenian Martyrs Day recognition bill, Senate Resolution 87, introduced by Senator TSONGAS, and which I cosponsored, also met a legislative roadblock, which will be described by Senator TSONGAS later this morning.

Mr. President, such State Department misstatements of facts were why I, along with Senator WILSON of California, introduced last year a bipartisan resolution to reaffirm the historical realities of the Armenian genocide—Senate Resolution 241, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the foreign policy of the United States should take account of the genocide of the Armenian people. With 27 cosponsors on this measure and additional cosponsors on a similar House measure, House Resolution 171, let us give notice to the State Department and the Government of Turkey that our voices will not be stilled.

There must be a constant struggle to fight against these efforts, which last year included a letter to Members of Congress from the Turkish Ambassador in Washington urging us not to speak on Martyrs Day because commemorating the so-called Armenian massacre, would have a "potentially adverse impact on United States-Turkish relations. * * *". Such threats did not stop 86 Senators and Representatives from recognizing Armenian Martyrs Day last year.

Mr. President, the historical record of the Armenian genocide and the role of the Turkish Ottoman Government is both exhaustive and overwhelming. A brief review of that history will reveal that, in 1915, the distinguished U.S. Ambassador of the Ottoman Empire, Henry Morgenthau, acting on instructions from the Secretaries of State William Jennings Bryan and Robert Lansing, organized and led protests by all nations, among them Turkey's allies, over what Ambassador Morgenthau referred to as Turkey's program of "race extermination."

Ambassador Morgenthau telegraphed the following to the Secretary of State on July 16, 1915:

Deportation of and excesses against peaceful Armenians is increasing and from harrowing reports of eye witnesses it appears that a campaign of race extermination is in

progress under a pretext of reprisal against rebellion.

Ambassador Morgenthau wrote the following in his book, "Ambassador Morgenthau's Story":

When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well and in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal the fact.

I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915.

So wrote our Ambassador to Turkey.

Mr. President, in 1920, the Armenian genocide was confirmed by the U.S. Senate in a resolution which read, in part:

The testimony adduced at the hearings by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee of Foreign Relations have clearly established the truth of the reported massacres and other atrocities from which the Armenian people have suffered.

More recently, during a 1979 U.N. debate on the Armenian genocide, the United States voted to include the Armenian genocide in a report entitled "Study of the Question of the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide."

On April 30, 1981, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council voted unanimously to include the Armenian genocide in its planned memorial to victims of the Holocaust.

Former President Carter said in 1978:

... (T)here was a concerted effort made to eliminate all the Armenian people. ...

And, in a proclamation honoring victims of the Holocaust, President Reagan said in 1981:

Like the genocide of the Armenians before it ... the lessons of the Holocaust must never be forgotten.

The record of historical archives and of U.S. policy relative to the Armenian genocide is clear—so clear that I find it difficult to understand what blinds the State Department to the historical facts as we know them to be.

With the support of the Congress, we can foresee construction of a Holocaust Museum in Washington, in which the Armenian genocide will be focused on and remembered; we can foresee passage of a resolution which expresses the sense of the Senate that the foreign policy of the United States should take account of the genocide of the Armenian people; we can foresee passage of a resolution designating April 24, 1985—1 year from today—as a national day of remembrance for victims of genocide, especially the 1.5 million Armenian martyrs, without any interference from the State Department; and we can finally, finally, foresee Senate ratification of the International Genocide Convention Treaty in order to, once and for all,

outlaw the crime of genocide. I might add that my good friend from Wisconsin, Senator PROXMIRE, has long been the leader in the effort to win passage of this treaty. This would be a long-overdue U.S. commemorative to the killing and suffering of the 1.5 million Armenians the world let down.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a paper written and delivered by the distinguished Prof. Richard G. Hovannissian of UCLA at the World Affairs Council in Pittsburgh last year entitled "The Armenian Case: Toward A Just Solution"—which eloquently and scholarly outlines the steps required to resolve peacefully the burning issues which remain unresolved between the Armenian people and the Turkish Government—be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ARMENIAN QUESTION: IN SEARCH OF A JUST SOLUTION

(By Richard G. Hovannissian)

Since the destruction of the Armenian people in the Ottoman Turkish Empire earlier in this century, new international crisis and conflicts have pushed the Armenian question from the consciousness of most opinion and policy making bodies. In cases where that consciousness has been sustained or revived because of special circumstances, policymakers have usually deemed it impolitic to address the issue, although taking care sometimes to lull the Armenians with words extolling their virtues as a proud, industrious, enduring, honest people.

The Armenians and the Armenian question are still remembered, of course, by some students of history and politics, by some well-read individuals, and especially by some elder citizens who recall that as children they made Sunday School offerings or else were forced by their parents to clean their plates with the admonition, "Remember the Starving Armenians." Yet, the ranks of these individuals have thinned and the public today is largely unaware of the Armenians and their national tragedy. This is not to say that Armenians have not tried to keep the public informed. For decades the survivors of genocide labored in a score of countries to pick up the pieces, to build new churches and cultural institutions to remind them of their lost homeland, and to preserve new generations in the face of strong, external assimilative pressures. They mourned their dead each year in April, the month marking the beginning of the deportations and massacres of 1915, and they wrote petitions to public officials, governments, and international bodies, but without significant, tangible results. They learned repeatedly that the success or failure of a cause had little to do with what they considered to be the concepts of political morality and justice.

But beginning in the 1970's, an unexpected phenomenon pushed the Armenian name back into print and not always in a positive light—much to the consternation of image-conscious Armenians. Coming forth with names such as the "Armenian Secret Army for the Liberation of Armenia" and the "Justice Commandos of the Armenian Genocide", small, clandestine groups emerged outside the established Armenian community and initiated a course of politi-

cal violence against Turkish officials, demanding recognition and recompense for the Armenian genocide from a still unrepentant government. Initially, there was doubt that the perpetrators were actually Armenian, but recent revelations leave little room for doubt.

All indications point to a decade of increased confrontation and bloodshed unless men of good will and particularly the two most interested parties, the Turkish government and the Armenian people, move to ease tension and prepare the way for a dialogue. During the first half century after the genocide, successive Turkish governments tried to remain silent or simply to dismiss the massacres. Recently there has been an apparent change in strategy. The Armenian challenges, rather than causing the Turkish government to cease attempts to conceal the horrendous skeleton in its closet, seem to have prompted an even more adamant stand, as well as an active counter-campaign of denial, refutation, and vilification. One may conjecture that Turkish strategists believe that the ability to reject Armenian claims for a few more decades will be rewarded with the disappearance of the Armenian question.

After all, time will have pushed the genocide into a previous century, all the eyewitnesses and survivors will have passed from the scene, and the grandchildren and great-grandchildren of the survivors will have been engulfed by assimilation with increasing rapidity. Yet, such calculations would be fraught with great risks and grave consequences, not excluding violent upheaval before such an end were achieved. Conversely, for the Armenians, it is a matter of life and death as they continue to be denied self-determination and are faced with cultural disintegration and loss of national identity.

Hence, it must be asked, Is there a reasonable, pacific answer to the Armenian question? Is there room for a dialogue? Is it possible that the interested sides can face a tragic, burning historical event and deal with it? Is there any way out of the obsession of one side with the past and the obsession of the other side with the denial of the past? Or must the future be abandoned to extremism and unbridled violence?

It is perhaps fitting in this connection to say a few words about Armenian history. Although tracing their lineage, according to epical-biblical traditions, to Noah, whose ark was said to have rested on Mount Ararat, the Armenian people actually passed through a long era of formation and emerged as a nation in the sixth century before Christ, in the great highlands between the Caspian, Black, and Mediterranean Seas, in an area now referred to as Eastern Anatolia and Transcaucasia, on both sides of the current Soviet-Turkish frontier. For the next two thousand years, they were led by their kings, nobles, and patriarchs, sometimes independently and often under the sway of powerful, neighboring empires of the East and of the West. Located on perhaps the most strategic and coveted crossroads of the ancient and medieval worlds, the Armenians not only managed to survive and thrive but also to develop a rich, distinctive culture by maintaining a delicate balance between Orient and Occident.

As the first people to adopt Christianity as the state religion, in about 301 A.D., the Armenians were often persecuted for their faith by fanatic invaders and alien overlords. By the end of the fourteenth century, the last Armenian kingdom had collapsed,

the nobility had been decimated in constant warfare, and the Armenian plateau had fallen under foreign subjugation. Most of the country ultimately came under Ottoman Turkish rule, while the eastern sector came first under Persian and then in the nineteenth century under Russian domination.

In the Ottoman Empire, which pressed to the gates of Vienna in the seventeenth century, the Armenians were included in a multinational and multireligious realm, but as a Christian minority they had to endure official discrimination and second-class citizenship. Inequality, including special taxes, the inadmissibility of legal testimony, and the prohibition on bearing arms, was the price paid to maintain their religion and sense of community. This is not to say that there were not prosperous merchants, traders, and artisans throughout the empire, even though most of the Armenian population remained rooted in its historic homeland, becoming, for the most part, tenant farmers or share-croppers under a dominant Muslim feudal-military elite.

Despite their disabilities, the Armenians lived in relative peace so long as the Ottoman Empire was strong and expanding. But as the Ottoman administrative, financial, and military structure crumbled under internal corruption and external European challenges in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, intolerance and exploitation increased, contributing to rebellions among the Christian peoples of the Balkans who won their freedom from the Turks with some European support. The Armenian situation, however, was different. Armenia was located far to the east, and nearly half of the Armenian population lived in areas outside their historic provinces. Under these circumstances, Armenian aspirations were directed toward egalitarian reforms and civil rights—that is, change within the system. The articulation of Armenian programs or reform, however, came at a time of heightened anarchy and oppression. Marauding nomadic tribal groups spread havoc throughout the region, the central government becoming unable or unwilling to guarantee the security of family, home, and property.

And each time the European Powers attempted to intercede for their own reasons, the Armenians suffered still greater persecution. In the reign of Sultan Abdul-Hamid II, 1876-1909, countless thousands were massacred in pogroms intended to intimidate the Armenians and discourage them from seeking European intercession or trying to follow the path of the Balkan Christians. Despairing of legal reforms, some Armenians began to organize resistance groups in the last decade of the nineteenth century, but the effectiveness of these nascent revolutionary societies was limited in fact of the sultan's mechanisms for suppression.

It is understandable, therefore, that the Armenians, perhaps more than any other minority group, rejoiced at the Young Turk revolution in 1908, which ushered in constitutional government and a year later sent Abdul-Hamid into exile. It was a time of optimism. Liberty and constitution were in the air. It was believed that the new leaders of the Ottoman Empire were committed to saving the realm through liberal reforms and the extension of equality to all Ottoman subjects regardless of religion and nationality.

One of the most interesting and, for the Armenians, tragic metamorphoses in

modern history was the process from 1908 to 1914 in which the seemingly liberal, egalitarian Young Turks were transformed into xenophobic nationalists bent on creating a new order and eliminating the Armenian question by eliminating the Armenian people. Taken advantage of by the European powers and courted by Kaiserian Germany, the Turkish government was seized in 1913 by Young Turk extremists, who were drawn to the newly articulated ideology of Turkism. The exclusivist principles of Turkism were to supplant the goal of Ottomanism and give justification to violent, brutal means to transform a multinational, multireligious realm into a homogeneous state based on the concept of one nation—one people. According to Helen Fein, "Accounting for Genocide," "The victims of twentieth-century premeditated genocide—the Jews, the Gypsies, the Armenians—were murdered in order to fulfill the state's design for a new order . . . War was used in both cases to transform the nation to correspond to the ruling elite's formula by eliminating groups conceived of as alien, enemies by definition."

The outbreak of World War I indeed placed the Armenians in extreme jeopardy, since their lands and people were situated on both sides of the Russo-Turkish frontier and would become the inevitable victims in any military action in that region. But the Turkish dictatorship headed by Minister of War Enver and Minister of Interior Talaat had already committed the Ottoman Empire to war against Russia in secret treaties with Germany. Yet Enver's anticipated swift victory in Transcaucasia was not attained and, failing miserably in the winter campaign of 1914-1915, he slipped back into the capital in humiliation, although claiming impressive military successes. The failure of the campaign, together with the Allied landings on the Gallipoli peninsula in the spring of 1915, may have eliminated any remaining hesitation to execute the plan to remove the Armenian population from one end of the empire to the other.

Claiming that the Armenians were untrustworthy, that they could offer aid and comfort to the enemy, and that they were in a state of imminent nationwide rebellion, Minister of Interior Talaat Pasha ordered their deportation from the war zones to relocation centers—actually the deserts of Syria and Mesopotamia. And in fact the Armenians were driven out, not only from the war zones, but from the width and breadth of the empire, except Constantinople (Istanbul) and Smyrna (Izmir), where foreign diplomats and merchants were concentrated. The whole of Asia Minor was put in motion. Armenians serving in the Ottoman armies had already been segregated into unarmed labor battalions and were now taken out in batches and murdered. Of the remaining population, the adult and teenage males were, as a pattern, swiftly separated from the deportation caravans and killed outright under the direction of the gendarmerie, young Turk agents, and bandit and nomadic groups prepared for the task. The greatest torment was reserved for the women and children who were driven for weeks over mountains and deserts, often dehumanized by being stripped naked and repeatedly preyed upon and abused. Many took their own and their children's lives by flinging themselves from cliffs and into rivers rather than prolonging their humiliation and torment.

In this manner an entire nation melted away and the Armenian people was effec-

tively eliminated from its homelands of nearly three thousand years. Of the survivors and refugees scattered throughout the Arab provinces and Transcaucasia, thousands more were to die of starvation, epidemic, and exposure, and even the memory of the nation was intended for obliteration as churches and monuments were desecrated and small children, snatched from their parents, were renamed and farmed out to be raised as Turks. Herbert Adams Gibbons described the process as "The Blackest Page of Modern History", whereas Henry Morgenthau, the United States Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire at that time wrote: "When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well, and, in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal the fact," Morgenthau continued.

"I have by no means told the most terrible details, for a complete narration of the sadistic orgies of which these Armenian men and women were the victims can never be printed in an American publication. Whatever crimes the most perverted instincts of the human mind can devise, and whatever refinements of persecutions and injustice the most debased imagination can conceive, became the daily misfortunes of this devoted people. I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915."

While the decimation of the Armenian people and the destruction of millions of persons in Central and Eastern Europe during the Nazi regime a quarter of a century later each had particular and unique features, historians and sociologists who have pioneered the field of victimology have drawn some startling parallels. These include the perpetration of genocide under the cover of a major international conflict, thus minimizing the possibility of external intervention; conception of the plan by a monolithic and megalomaniac regime; espousal of an ideology giving purpose and justification to chauvinism, racism, and intolerance toward elements resisting or deemed unworthy of assimilation; imposition of strict party discipline and secrecy during the period of preparation; formation of extralegal special armed forces to ensure the rigorous execution of the operation; provocation of public hostility toward the victim group and ascribing to it the very excesses to which it would be subject; certainty of the vulnerability of the intended prey (demonstrated in the Armenian case in the previous general massacres of 1894-1896 and 1909), exploitation of advances in mechanization and communication (the telegraph) to achieve unprecedented means of control, coordination, and thoroughness; and use of sanctions such as promotions and the incentive to loot, plunder, and vent passions without restraint or, conversely, the dismissal and punishment of reluctant officials and the intimidation of persons who might consider harboring members of the victim group.

In the West, the Armenian genocide evoked sentiments of sympathy and outrage. The Allied Powers declared collectively, "In view of this new crime of Turkey against humanity and civilization, the Allied Governments make known publicly that they will hold all members of the Turkish Government, as well as those officials who

have participated in these massacres, personally responsible." French officials echoed British Prime Minister Lloyd George's view that after the war the peace settlement should guarantee "the redemption of the Armenian valleys forever from the bloody misrule with which they had been stained by the infamies of the Turk." In the United States the hand of charity was extended across the ocean, to keep alive as many of the survivors as possible and to help the Armenian people escape complete obliteration. Leaders of both parties and all branches of government called for the restoration of the survivors to their ancestral lands and the safeguarding of their collective existence, whereas President Wilson's celebrated Fourteen Points offered the Armenians "an undoubted security of life and absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development."

This, too, was the attitude of the Paris Peace Conference, which declared at its opening in January 1919, that because of Turkish misgovernment and massacres, Armenia and the Arab provinces would be completely severed from the Turkish empire. In pleading the case of the defeated empire, the new Turkish prime minister tried to deflect the guilt by pointing an accusing finger at the small clique that had perverted the government, admitting nonetheless that there had occurred "misdeeds which are such as to make the conscience of mankind shudder forever." In reply, the Allied Powers, drawing attention to the massacres "whose calculated atrocity equals or exceeds anything in recorded history," rejected any attempt to minimize or circumvent the crime. Sent out from Paris on a fact-finding mission to the Armenian provinces, American Major General James G. Harbord confirmed that "mutilization, violation, torture, and death have left their haunting memories in a hundred beautiful Armenian valleys, and the traveler in that region is seldom free from the evidence of this most colossal crime of all the ages".

Yet, ironically, despite all the words and evidence, the "conscience of mankind" did not shudder for long before this "most colossal crime of all the ages." It is true that in 1920 the Allies finally imposed the Treaty of Sevres upon the sultan's government, creating on paper a moderately sized united Armenian republic, but, recoiling from the burdens of the world war, the European Powers and the United States proved unwilling to shoulder the moral and material responsibilities to execute the peace and to restore the Armenian people to their homeland and help them build a free nation. Rather, after the successful rise and consolidation of the Turkish Nationalist movement under Mustafa Kemal, the European Powers bowed to political, economic, and military expediency in the treaties of Lausanne in 1923 and turned away from the miserable Armenians and the Armenian question. The refugees were barred from returning home, and, except for those who settled in the small Armenian state that had been created in Transcaucasia in 1918 and (forcibly) sovietized in 1920, remained dispersed throughout the Middle East, Europe, and America.

The passage of time and the strategic geopolitical position assigned to Turkey in the calculations of the world powers further removed the Armenian issue from the realm of international diplomacy. A new generation of politicians, correspondents, and academics lost interest in the Armenians—perhaps the fate of most losers in history.

Some gradually began to rationalize the existence of the Republic of Turkey within its given boundaries by tending to rationalize the events that had led to this eventuality. Whether because of naïveté, assumed objectivity, or self interests, a few even introduced the adjectives "alleged" and "asserted" in reference to the Armenian massacres, even though their own newspaper files and national archives were replete with the awesome evidence of the systematic annihilation. Perhaps Adolf Hitler had good cause in 1939 to declare, according to the Nuremberg trial transcripts, "Who, after all, speaks today of the extermination of the Armenians."

But unlike the Armenian case, the atrocities of World War II did not pass unrequited, nor have they been allowed to blur in public awareness and international relations. Hundreds of persons charged with crimes against humanity were brought to trial and punished, and the Federal Republic of Germany, while denouncing and disassociating itself from the erstwhile Nazi regime, nonetheless accepted the burden of collective guilt and made recompense to the survivors, the families of the murdered millions, and the governments having a special relationship with the victimized groups. By contrast, the Ankara government has, ever since the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, refused to acknowledge the criminal actions taken against the Armenian people. Perhaps it is the strength of the moral claims against Turkey that has made that government all the more unwilling to accept those claims, afraid that acknowledgment of a major historical transgression could then lead to pressures to make reparations and possibly even partial territorial restitution.

In recent years, therefore, the Ankara government, aroused by renewed efforts of the dispersed Armenian communities to challenge the erasure of the Armenian case, has intensified efforts to keep the issue from again becoming a topic of international diplomacy or even from being mentioned in international bodies.

A concerted high level campaign was launched to expunge only a passing reference to the Armenian massacres in a United Nations' subcommission draft report. Turkish academic personnel and institutions and a few non-Turkish academics have been used to give a scholarly semblance to the regrettable goal to deny and obscure the genocide. Strong diplomatic pressures and military considerations have been employed in attempts to prevent the erection of Armenian memorials, the participation of foreign dignitaries at Armenian commemorative observances, the preparation of motion pictures and other media productions relating to the genocide, and the inclusion of the Armenian experience in the Holocaust Museum being planned for Washington, D.C.

Speaking before the Los Angeles World Affairs Council in November, 1982, Turkish Ambassador Sukru Elekdogan, declared: "The accusations that Ottoman Turks, sixty-five years ago, during World War I, perpetrated systematic massacre of the Armenian population in Turkey, to annihilate them and to seize their homeland, is totally baseless." And a recent Turkish publication from Washington, D.C., entitled "Setting the Record Straight on Armenian Propaganda Against Turkey" begins as follows: "In recent years claims have been made by some Armenians in Europe, America, and elsewhere that the Armenians suffered terrible

misrule in the Ottoman Empire. Such claims are absurd." A few pages later, we read: "There was no genocide committed against the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire before or during World War I. No genocide was planned or ordered by the Ottoman government and no genocide was carried out. Recent scholarly research has discovered that the stories of massacres were in fact largely invented by Armenian nationalist leaders in Paris and London during World War I and spread throughout the world through the British intelligence."

One should not be surprised if the United States Department of State, whose own archives contain voluminous materials on the deportations and massacres, will find it expedient tacitly to foster this type of falsification by acknowledging the receipt of such publications with thanks or by maintaining a telling silence. It is no novelty that expediency frequently reigns over morality in politics, but it seems to me that it is also no novelty that humanitarians and statesmen must strive toward truth and justice.

Is there any solution to this problem or is there only the prospect of heightened frustration, increased extremism, and explosive confrontation? I cannot be very optimistic. Yet, the narrowest avenues of hope cannot be abandoned, and the Turkish government should be assisted in seeing that its own national interests require a mitigation of its adamant position. The public, too, such as this very audience, must be brought to understand that this and like issues are not just old world feuds and smoldering ancient animosities having no bearing on today's realities. They are fundamental matters of national conduct and human rights.

What is it that the Armenians seek? Obviously, there are various gradations in their desiderata, so let me read what the most politically-active and strongly-nationalistic groups say:

"1. The toleration of genocide and its acceptance as a "solution" to any problem leads only to its repeated use, just as the world's indifference to the Armenian Genocide and its aftermath led Hitler to cite it as a precedent and justification for his own crimes. The use of Genocide as an instrument of national policy, by any nation at any time, is a crime against all Humanity, and it must be universally condemned. There can be no statute of limitations on Genocide, and the genocidal state should be denied the territorial, material, or political fruits of Genocide.

"2. The Eastern provinces of what is today called Turkey had been Armenian lands for two thousand years before the Turkish armies even entered that part of the world. Despite the murder and expulsion of the proprietor Armenian population, these territories remain no less Armenian today and must be returned to the rightful owners, the Armenian people.

"3. As long as Armenians remain in forced exile from their ancestral heartland, subject to cultural assimilation and often more direct pressures and as long as the handful of Armenians remaining in Turkey are harassed into cultural oblivion, then the genocidal act initiated in 1915 continues. It will cease only when Armenians again occupy their own lands and control their own destiny."

Many would regard these demands as being maximalist, and would, through discussion and compromise, stand at intermediate positions. Indeed, the one demand that is shared universally by Armenians of all walks of life and at all stages of accultura-

tion is for an admission of wrongdoing and the extension of recognition and dignity to the hundreds of thousands of victims whose very memory the Turkish authorities and the rationalizing revisionists would eliminate. Underlying the search for a solution to the Armenian question is the word "dialogue". It is in dialogue that the beginning of a long and difficult process aimed at ultimate resolution might be achieved. It is not a step without serious risks, and it requires enormous courage.

The Turkish government should be encouraged by its friends and allies to take the necessary first step toward the initiation of dialogue. The enervating and harmful malaise of Armeno-Turkish alienation can and must be surmounted. Every person present can assist in that reconciliation through concern for the truth and the rights of peoples to live beyond the specter of genocide and cultural oblivion. Yet, until the elusive, auspicious step toward reconciliation is actually taken, the Armenian people will have no choice but to reiterate time and again George Santayana's admonition, "Those who do not remember the past are condemned to relive it".

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that paper written and delivered by Hagop Martin Deranian, D.D.S., of Worcester, MA, at the Armenian Rugs Society Symposium in New York in 1982 entitled "Calvin Coolidge and the Armenian Orphan Rug"—a moving story of how 400 Armenian orphan girls in Lebanon, victims of the genocide, wove a beautiful oriental rug which was presented to President Coolidge as a symbol of thanks for the efforts of the United States to help relieve the suffering of survivors of the genocide—be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALVIN COOLIDGE AND THE ARMENIAN ORPHAN RUG

(Hagop Martin Deranian, D.D.S.)

A shy, silent, New England Republican, President Calvin Coolidge led the United States during the boisterous jazz age of the Roaring 1920's.

It was a time of great prosperity which stimulated carefree behavior and a craving for entertainment. The nation's "flaming youth" featured in the novels of F. Scott Fitzgerald set the pace. Motion pictures began to talk with Al Jolson starring in "The Jazz Singer." America defied Prohibition and gangsters grew rich by bootlegging liquor. A popular song summed up the whole era—"Ain't We Got Fun?"

Coolidge was the sixth vice president to become President upon the death of a Chief Executive. Coolidge was vacationing on his father's farm in Vermont when President Warren G. Harding died in 1923.

Early in the morning of August 3, 1923, by the light of a kerosene lamp, the elder Coolidge, a notary public, administered the oath of office in the dining room. After that, President Coolidge went back to bed—and slept. Years afterward, when asked to recall his first thoughts in becoming President, he replied—"I thought I could swing it." Time proved that he was right.

In November 1924, Coolidge was elected to a full four year term. He enjoyed great popularity and people cherished him for having

the virtues of their forefathers. His reputation for wisdom was based on his dry wit and robust common sense. He issued few unnecessary public statements and rarely wasted a word, even sitting silently through official dinners. At one social affair in Washington, a woman told him she had bet that she could get more than two words out of him. Coolidge dryly replied, "You lose."

By utter and stark contrast, a half world away from America in what we call Lebanon today, the life of a Swiss Protestant missionary, Jacob Kuenzler, was destined to touch that of President Coolidge through the intermediacy of an oriental rug woven by destitute Armenian orphan girls.

"Papa" Kuenzler or Dr. Kuenzler, as he was known, was not really a doctor. A native of Switzerland, he found his vocation as a young man with the Brother Deacons, a Protestant Nursing Order. He joined a mission in Urfa, Turkey in 1895 and served the Armenian community in Turkey for 25 years during those appalling years.

In the early 1920's, the Kuenzlers began work for the Near East Relief Organization. They helped evacuate thousands of Armenian orphans from Turkey to the relative security of Syria. In the beautiful village of Ghazir, high up in the mountains about 40 miles north of Beirut, they were placed in charge of a large number of Armenian girls in an old monastery.

During the summer of 1923, a young Armenian lad appeared asking for work. He had been a student at the German orphanage in Urfa where he had learned how to dye wool. For some time, "Papa" Kuenzler nurtured the idea of starting a rug factory in Ghazir where the girls could learn the art of weaving rugs. He estimated that a thousand dollars would be sufficient to cover the initial expenses of buying materials and of setting up a few looms in one of the houses that the orphanage was renting. He wrote of his plans to the Near East Relief headquarters, which was spending ten dollars a month for the care of each of his orphans. Instead of a thousand dollars, headquarters sent him four hundred, which disappointed him but which did not discourage him. With only two looms he started what he called the Ghazir Rug Factory.¹

It soon became a flourishing enterprise with the number of looms increasing first to twenty and finally to a hundred. Eventually a thousand girls learned to weave rugs and four hundred of these were awarded a certificate of proficiency. The original capital of four hundred dollars, grew to twenty-five thousand dollars.

"Papa" conceived the idea that his girls should weave a large rug and present it as a gift to The White House in recognition of the help which the American people had given to the Armenian orphans. A large loom was set up for a so-called "Isphahan" rug, measuring twenty-three square meters and containing four and a half million knots. Four hundred girls, working in turns, spent many months on its completion. It was then sent to Washington.

The presentation of the rug was prominently reported in the December 3, 1925 issue of the New York Times under the heading: "President Receives Rug Woven by Orphans of Near East and Praises Work on Relief."

¹ I am indebted to Ida Alamuddin, the Kuenzler's daughter, whose book, "Papa Kuenzler and the Armenians" records the story of the Ghazir Rug Factory.

"A committee of the Near East Relief today presented to President Coolidge at the White House one Isphahan rug woven for him by Armenian orphans in the Near East Relief Orphanage in Syria, as a token of their appreciation of America's part in preserving their lives. An inscription on the reverse side of the rug reads: 'Made by Armenian girls in the Ghazir, Syria orphanage of the Near East Relief and presented as a Golden Rule token of appreciation to President Coolidge.'"

"The presentation was made by John H. Finley, Vice-Chairman of the Near East Relief, who, in his speech said:

"Mr. President: Your words as to the observance of Golden Rule Sunday last year have gone out into all the earth, as the lines of which the Psalmist spoke. They have been especially appreciated by the orphan children back in the lands which we think of as the cradle of our civilization. Many grateful responses have come. But the most impressive is this beautiful rug which the children in the orphanage in the Lebanon have made for you. It seems to have in its memories of the trees and birds and beasts of the Garden of Eden."

"They began work on it as soon as your sympathetic words reach them. As only four girls could work at one time at the loom, they have been ten months making it and it has reached here just in time for the Golden Rule Sunday this year."

"What a task it was is to be known from the fact that they tied 4,404,247 knots in its making. But it was a labor of love. They have tied into it the gratitude of tens of thousands of children to you and to America. And what they have tied into it will never be untied."

"It is sent to adorn the dearest of our temples, the White House of our President."

In reply, President Coolidge tonight sent the following letter to Dr. Finley.

WHITE HOUSE, December 4, 1925.

"My Dear Dr. Finley: The beautiful rug woven by the children in the orphanage in the Lebanon has been received. This, their expression of gratitude for what we have been able to do in this country for their aid, is accepted by me as a token of their goodwill to the people of the United States, who have assisted in the work of the Near East Relief. Will you be good enough to extend to these orphans my thanks and the thanks of the vast number of our citizens whose generosity this labor of love is intended to acknowledge. The rug has a place of honor in the White House, where it will be a daily symbol of good-will on earth."

"Thank you, Dr. Finley, for your services in making this presentation and for the sentiment which went with it."

"Most sincerely yours,

CALVIN COOLIDGE."

The story does not end there. Some of the young girls who wove the rug were brought to America to work at a loom as a demonstration during the Sesquicentennial celebration of the founding of the United States in 1926.

The Department of Missions of the Episcopal Church arranged for the girls to shake hands with the President on November 4, 1926. It must have been an intensely emotional meeting, as is this whole matter of the Ghazir Rug. Afterward, the following letter was sent to the President's Secretary by Rev. Dr. William C. Erhardt:

"I thank you for your courtesy in arranging an interview with the President on Thursday last. You may assure the Presi-

dent of our appreciation of his kindness. I suppose this interview differed from the ordinary one, in that he was permitted to show his native kindness to little children, and thus give pleasure, rather than if the occasion demanded that he meet visitors in order to cater to the vanity of man."

The Near East Relief was an American act of compassion. When asked to intervene, the German Ambassador to Turkey said to the American Ambassador, Henry Morgenthau, "The United States is apparently the only country that takes much interest in the Armenians. Your Missionaries are their friends and your people have constituted themselves their guardians. The whole question of helping them is therefore an American matter."

Near East Relief was one of the largest philanthropic expeditions ever organized in its time. It was chartered by an act of Congress on August 6, 1919. Under the slogan of "Save the Armenians", Near East Relief collected \$91,000,000 in donations and \$25,000,000 for food and supplies during its 15 years of service. It healed and comforted millions of desperate people and rescued, fed and trained 132,000 orphan children. "No private enterprise," President Coolidge said, "ever undertaken by Americans has accomplished more to arouse, in the minds and hearts of all the people of the countries in which this organization has carried on its operations, a sincere regard and even affection for America."

Calvin Coolidge's briefest and most dramatic public statement occurred on August 2, 1927, when he simply announced, "I do not choose to run for President in 1928."

What happened to the rug woven by Armenian orphans after 1928 is somewhat speculative. Apparently, Coolidge took it with him when he left the White House. In 1930, he bought an estate in Northampton, Massachusetts, called "The Beeches" and it may have been used in one of its 12 rooms. He also maintained his boyhood home in Plymouth, Vermont, where he summered.

Soon after Calvin Coolidge's death in 1933, Mrs. Coolidge sold "The Beeches" and moved to another home in Northampton, Massachusetts where she lived until the year of her death in 1957.

The Coolidge's surviving son, John, graduated from Amherst College, his father's alma mater, and lived in Farmington, Connecticut. Mr. Coolidge, who is now 76 years of age, maintains a home in the ancestral village of Plymouth, Vermont, where he resides from May to October.

Dr. and Mrs. P. Vahé Haig of California² and others, have shared the dream that the rug would one day be returned to our nation's capital.

I visited the Coolidge Homestead in Plymouth, Vermont recently and even though I could not see John Coolidge personally, I wrote to him afterward about the rug which was not on public view. I am thrilled to share with you his response in a letter to me dated September 14, 1982: "You may be interested to learn that the White House is interested in obtaining the rug and we are sending it there."

This treasured and symbolic rug will once again "adorn the dearest of our temples, the White House of our President," after an absence of over five decades.

There it will serve as a silent and ongoing reminder of that hour in American history

which represents, to me, the height of its fulfillment as a nation of good-will and compassion. At the same time, it will serve as a memorial to those orphans whose nimble, yet sad, fingers wove into its warp and weft a permanent remembrance of the depths of Armenia's blackest hour.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, every April 24, Armenians all over the world reflect on the proud heritage and rich culture—from the time of St. Gregory the Illuminator, who led Armenia to become the first Christian nation of the world in A.D., 301 to the present, where Armenians make important contributions to the world of business, philanthropy, academia, the arts and sciences, and yes, politics. It is through such reflections that we are able to appreciate the reasons which have kept the Armenian people so vital a community and so valuable a part of our Nation.

While the survivors of the genocide mourn their lost ones, they also must pass along their stories of tragedy so that the memory of those who perished are not forgotten by the world. The martyrs live on through them—through each and all of us who remember. Those of the younger generation should never forget the sacrifice of the ancestors. They, also, should never forget the rich culture which has contributed so much to the world community. And together, they should perpetuate the story of the Armenian people and share its lessons with all the people of the world. Only in that way can some of the suffering of the genocide be redeemed.

VICTIMS OF ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

● Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. President, today I am joining my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Michigan, in paying homage to the victims of the Armenian genocide. April 24 is a deeply important day for people of Armenian ancestry. Each year on this day, Armenians remember the 1.5 million of their brethren murdered in Ottoman Turkey between 1915 and 1923. They remember the 500,000 Armenians who survived the forced exile during which others were starved, tortured, and killed. They know that Armenian-Americans still alive today were among these valiant survivors. The depth of feeling with which Armenians recall those 8 years can scarcely be put into words.

But the Armenian genocide has a profound importance that extends beyond any one people. It was the first of several genocides perpetrated in this century. Far too little public attention was paid it, despite extensive news accounts emerging from Turkey even as it happened, and many subsequent accounts by observers and historians. Had the world swiftly and fully awakened to the horror of the Armenian genocide, who knows how much earlier we might have recognized the true face of Hitler's "final solution?"

The lesson of the Armenian genocide, like that of the Holocaust, still beckons: we have a moral obligation to ingrain history into our memory and understanding. Only in this way can we pay true homage to the victims of genocide—by seeking to keep history from being repeated.

The dangers of denying historical atrocities are enormous. In the 69 years since the beginning of the Armenian genocide, we have periodically heard denials. Voices have whispered in our ears that, no, 1.5 million did not die; that those who did die were not innocent victims but combatants; that those who killed them were not doing so according to any plan for racial extermination. Such voices are often superficially persuasive. When they grow insistent, we are tempted to give them credence. But we must not. Every claim they make is false. From the time the killings began, the exact nature and extent of the genocide was an indisputable and documented fact. Today we still hear voices, but we must resist them with all our strength. Our children are relying on us.

In this body, testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations held after the First World War included abundant evidence of the genocide. Henry Morgenthau, our Ambassador in Constantinople, filed frequent and detailed dispatches documenting the genocide, including one stating that "a campaign of race extermination is in progress" against the Armenians. First-person accounts and news reports bore out such assertions again and again.

Because of my conviction that a greater effort is needed to bring the Armenian genocide into the public consciousness, and that the victims and circumstances of any genocide cannot too often be remembered, I introduced a resolution last year that would have designated today as a day of remembrance for all victims of genocide, especially those of Armenian ancestry who died between 1915 and 1923. Senate Joint Resolution 87 was placed on the Senate Calendar on April 5. I regret to say that the resolution has been held from floor consideration on the Republican side. Over a third of the Senate has cosponsored the resolution, including 14 Republicans. I frankly do not see how anyone could object to such a simple act of homage to so many victims of genocide. Yet the day is here, and the resolution has not been released for consideration.

The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council has voted unanimously to give a place of prominence to the Armenian genocide in the Holocaust Museum here in Washington. This is fitting and an encouraging sign. Such a permanent memorial will help to raise public awareness of the events in

² I wish to express my thanks to Dr. and Mrs. Haig for sharing with me their research and correspondence concerning this rug.

Turkey during and after World War I. I give my unqualified support to this and all other efforts to further peace and understanding through public education—even, and indeed, especially, when that education comprises some of history's darkest episodes.

Mr. President, Armenians have set today aside as a day of remembrance. All the people of the world would do well to follow the example of their remembrance. We must commit ourselves to remembering the tragedy of the Armenian genocide. For the sake of the victims and the survivors. For the sake of their counterparts in Nazi Germany, Southeast Asia, and elsewhere. And for our own sake.●

COMMEMORATING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

● Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from Michigan in cosponsoring a resolution which calls our attention to the 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children who perished in the early part of this century as victims of an act of genocide.

This tragedy must continue to live in the memories and writings of man. We must make sure that this terrible event does not become clouded nor forgotten with the advance of history. We must keep this solemn memory of the past, in order to prevent other such tragedies in the future. Let this day of remembrance be a reminder to all generations of the criminal persecution of the Armenian people. Let us be instructed and admonished by the Polish writer Yashinsky, who survived a Nazi concentration camp only to die in a Russian camp: "Fear not your enemies for they can only kill you, fear not your friends for they can only betray you. Fear the indifferent who permit the killers and betrayers to walk safely on the Earth."●

ARMENIAN MARTYRS DAY

● Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating the 69th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, the first but tragically not the last such atrocity of the 20th century. We all know the awful details, 1.5 million Armenians, men, women, and children, slain between 1915 and 1923 by the Ottoman Government of Turkey. We know from the reports of our own U.S. Ambassador Henry Morgenthau who wired the Secretary of State in July 1915:

Deportation of and excesses against peaceful Armenians is increasing and from harrowing reports of eye witnesses it appears that a campaign of race extermination is in progress under a pretext of reprisal against rebellion.

We know from the tragic reports of massacred families by those lucky enough to escape.

Today we commemorate those 1.5 million victims of the Armenian genocide. We cannot erase the horror that sears the collective soul of Armenians

wherever they might be. It is a tragedy that the crime of genocide has yet to be wiped from the face of the Earth. So let us remember the Armenian genocide victims by rededicating ourselves, as individuals and as a nation, to insuring that such a nightmare is never again visited on any people anywhere on this Earth. We can best serve their memory by preventing such inhumanity in the future, and by remembering, I pray, we will prevent it.●

COMMEMORATING ARMENIAN MARTYRS DAY

● Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I join my colleagues today in commemorating the 69th anniversary of Armenian Martyrs Day.

The Armenian massacre of 1915 to 1923, the first genocide of this century, stands out because of its scope and brutality. One and a half million Armenian men, women, and children were killed and a half million survivors were forced to flee from their ancestral homeland.

I am a cosponsor of the resolution which designates April 24 as a day of remembrance for all victims of genocide, particularly those who perished in the Armenian massacre. The purpose of the resolution is to recognize, acknowledge, and denounce the atrocity against the Armenian people. Its intent is also to engrain in our memories this event as a small part of our effort to insure that genocide does not recur.

I deeply sympathize with those whose relatives were killed in the Armenian massacre. I understand their anguish, and I share their outrage that there are those who still deny that the massacre indeed took place. The facts of the Armenian massacre have been well documented and affirmed over the past six decades. To refute these facts is to perpetrate yet another crime against the Armenian people.

We cannot reverse events of the past. But it is possible and necessary that we learn from the brutal lesson of the Armenian genocide and do what we can to prevent a recurrence of the extermination of a people because of their nationality, race or religion.●

● Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today marks the 69th anniversary of the willful massacre of 1.5 million Armenians at the hands of the Turks during World War I. Senate Joint Resolution 87, introduced by my distinguished colleague, Senator TSONGAS, designates today as a day of remembrance for the victims of this heinous act. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill and to join with Armenians throughout the world in observing Armenian Martyrs Day.

Before World War I, Armenians, a gentle, highly cultured people, lived alongside the Turks and demanded only tolerance and freedom from their Turkish rulers. In response, the Turk-

ish Government launched a coordinated drive to round up and eliminate every Armenian man, woman, and child. Today, we honor those courageous individuals who were exterminated for no other reason than that their national heritage was considered alien by the Turkish leadership.

The Armenian genocide was a forerunner to another dark episode in the 20th century history of mankind: the Holocaust. The Holocaust is a sad reminder that those who forget history are condemned to repeat it. The Armenian genocide and the Holocaust show us that man possesses the pernicious quality of bigotry and the capacity to be cruel. We must never forget the despicable treatment suffered by the Armenians and the Jews at the hands of their fellow men. We must keep the memories of these solemn and painful events alive in order that history will not repeat itself yet again.

Genocide is the most heinous act that man can perpetrate against his fellow man. Yet, it was not until the Nazis slaughtered 6 million Jews that the world recognized genocide for what it is. In response to the Holocaust, the United Nations declared genocide a war crime. I am proud to say that my father, as U.S. Representative to the United Nations War Crimes Commission, played an instrumental role in convincing the State Department to take the position that genocide should be declared a war crime.

If we are truly concerned about eliminating the evil of genocide from the heart of mankind; if justice and compassion are values which we sincerely cherish; if the death of 1.5 million Armenians is to be more than a tragic footnote to our time; then we must not forget the brutal assault on human dignity which was the Armenian genocide.●

ARMENIAN MARTYRS DAY

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, today's commemoration of the anniversary of Armenian Martyrs Day is, I believe, one of the most important matters which merits the Senate's attention. Like all acts of inhumanity which scar the history of mankind, the Armenian genocide of 1915 must be remembered, and its lessons understood and appreciated.

We who join in this commemorative colloquy today on the Senate floor are guided by the words of Elie Wiesel: "To forget is to make oneself an accomplice of the executioner."

While the most valuable lessons of human experience are those learned from our mistakes, nothing can be learned from the mistakes that we fail to admit. The world's failure to acknowledge the Armenian genocide is a painful confirmation of this truism. A simple reading of history clearly shows that the Armenian genocide did

in fact provide Hitler with a precedent for his crimes—a genocide which took the lives of 6 million Jews and millions of other innocent people. Even today, as we note the 69th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, in which over 1½ million innocent men, women, and children lost their lives, the Turkish Government refuses to acknowledge the role of its predecessors in this atrocity.

Today I join with members of the Armenian community and the Congress in calling upon our Government to reaffirm the U.S. policy of recognizing the Armenian genocide, and, in so doing, encourage the long overdue acknowledgement by the Turkish Government of its role in the massacre. Only then will justice be brought to the Armenian community.

While we are powerless to alter the tragic events of the past, we can do much to shape the future. With the help of the Armenian people and all those whose lives have been touched by oppression, we must work to eliminate the injustice, torture and inhumanity which has been inflicted upon people whose only crime was the desire to live. As long as we allow circumstances to exist where people are denied their very right to exist, our civilization and our own humanity are very much in doubt.

Despite the pain of recalling the horrible details of the Armenian genocide, we must never forget. Those who do not know must be educated. Because for us, as a nation, to forget, and for others never to know, reduces our vigilance, masks the threat of repeated horrors and denies the victims of these crimes the dignity and memory they deserve. Only when we recognize the past violations of people's rights can we truly appreciate the necessity of treating others as individuals whose hopes and ambitions are as worthy as our own.

To insure that this and future generations of Americans remain sensitive to the horrors of the Armenian genocide, a memorial to its victims will be made a permanent part of the U.S. Holocaust Museum in Washington, DC. I applaud this effort.

Another important step in demonstrating our commitment to human rights and our understanding of the lessons of the genocides of the 20th century is the ratification of the Genocide Convention. For 34 years the convention has been before the community of nations. Conspicuously absent from the list of 88 nations which have ratified the convention is the United States, despite its role as a leading force for human rights.

Clearly the time has come for the world to recognize that the use of genocide as an instrument of national policy—by any nation at any time—is a crime against all mankind that must be universally condemned.●

THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, today we commemorate the 69th anniversary of Armenian Martyrs Day, the date on which the Turkish Government began its systematic annihilation of over a million Armenian people. The events of 1915 uprooted an entire nation, eliminating leaders and intellectuals, and scattering the remaining homeless survivors around the world.

We commemorate the Armenian genocide in part to pay tribute to its survivors and to the memory of its victims, and in part to reinforce our own determination to insure that such deeds will not be repeated. As citizens of a nation founded on the ideals of human dignity and freedom, we must make sure that we will never remain indifferent or impassive in the face of such assaults on the basic essence of our humanity.

The Armenian-American community has always played a vital role in our pluralistic, democratic society. Never has this been truer than it is today. Their contributions to the cultural, social, political and economic life of America is priceless and unique. Armenian-American Marylanders make daily contributions to the vitality and character of our State.

Centuries of oppression and persecution did not succeed in snuffing out the rich faith and traditions of the Armenian civilization. Americans of Armenian descent have kept alive their noble heritage, and in so doing have enriched the lives of all Americans. The memory of suffering so terrible has not led to bitterness or violence among the Armenians; instead it has strengthened faith and reinforced the commitment to justice and humane values.

The Armenian people, who have lived with tragedy, are committed to the proposition that the world will understand as they do the meaning of that tragedy. It has reinforced the wise and generous humanity which has found expression in the family, the church and the community. From this, our Nation has benefited.●

● Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I want to begin today by commending Senators LEVIN and TSONGAS for organizing what has now become an annual commemoration on the floor of the Senate of the massacre in Turkey early in this century of 1.5 million Armenians and the forced exile of half a million more.

The agony of the Armenians has been described as "the forgotten genocide."

It is not forgotten—not by us and not by the descendants of the survivors, many of whom will gather this weekend to remember and to reflect upon one of the greatest tragedies ever suffered by any nation. But, Mr. President, the pain of those memories is compounded by the sad fact that to

this day, the Turkish Government denies that the wholesale slaughter of the Armenians ever took place.

The facts are undeniable.

Before World War I, 2,500,000 Armenians lived in the Ottoman Empire most of them in the region that had for many centuries been the Armenian homeland. Today, fewer than 100,000 declared Armenians reside in Turkey.

What happened to them?

On May 27, 1915, the Ottoman authorities promulgated an edict of deportation against the Armenians.

Armenian men were driven from their homes and massacred by the tens of thousands.

Women, children, and old people were herded into the deserts of Syria. Those who did not die of starvation, exposure and disease became the victims of brigands and guards.

Henry Morgenthau, Ambassador to Turkey of the then neutral United States, states in his memoirs that there could be no doubt about the facts, or about Turkish intentions.

The American Ambassador wrote:

When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race: They understood this well, and, in their conversations with me they made no particular attempt to conceal the fact.

I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the suffering of the Armenian race in 1915.

Ambassador Morgenthau was not the only foreign dignitary to speak out on the plight of the Armenians.

The New York Times reported on October 11, 1915, that Pope Benedict XV "has written an autograph letter to the Sultan of Turkey interceding for the unfortunate people."

On October 22, 1915, the Times reported that:

Confidential advice received today by the State Department said the German Government had officially made efforts to alleviate alleged atrocities upon Armenians in Turkey, but that Turkish officials apparently displayed lack of interest in such endeavors.

Germany was, of course, Ottoman Turkey's most important wartime ally and would hardly have cooperated in any effort to defame the Turkish Government.

The record is clear.

The Armenians were slaughtered.

And they were slaughtered on orders of the Turkish authorities of the day.

It is a fact—a terrible fact that must not be denied or trivialized or treated as just another political issue.

Three years ago, in a speech given here in the Capitol rotunda, Elie Wiesel, chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, made a telling point.

Professor Wiesel said:

Before the planning of the final solution Hitler asked "Who remembers the Armenians?" He was right. No one remembered them, as no one remembered the Jews. Rejected by everyone, they felt expelled from history.

I believe that we have a profound obligation to remember—to make a point of remembering. And we have that obligation not only to the victims, but to ourselves.●

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to extend beyond the hour of 12:30 p.m. with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

TRIBUTE TO DR. BENJAMIN E. MAYS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a distinguished educator from my home State, Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, who passed away recently at the age of 89. To his family and his friends across the country, I extend my sympathies.

One of eight children who grew up near Greenwood, SC, Dr. Mays was a tireless advocate for education and social justice. He rose from humble beginnings as a farmhand to be president of Morehouse College in Atlanta, GA, and served for 12 years as president of the Atlanta Board of Education.

His commitment to education was an intensely personal one, and it earned him membership in the prestigious academic honor fraternity of Phi Beta Kappa. Later his studies would earn him a doctorate degree; 47 honorary degrees in law, divinity, and the humanities; numerous plaques and awards for academic excellence; and, of course, a national reputation as a leader in the field of education.

Dr. Mays also served with distinction as president of the United Negro College Fund, providing outstanding leadership in the cause of improving education opportunities for blacks and minorities.

Mr. President, our Nation has lost a remarkable man, whose soft-spoken style of leadership and commitment to improving the human condition earned him a place in the hearts of many.

Although he moved from South Carolina to Georgia, many people from my State have paid tribute to him as a native son. Three years ago, his birthplace was renamed in his honor as Mays Crossroads, and a granite marker was erected denoting Dr. Mays' many accomplishments.

In addition, Dr. Mays was inducted earlier this year into the South Carolina Hall of Fame in Myrtle Beach and his portrait now hangs in the South Carolina Statehouse in Columbia.

In order to share more about the accomplishments and life of Dr. Mays with my colleagues in the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that several newspaper articles, from the Columbia State, the Greenwood Index-Journal, and the Anderson Independent-Mail, be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenwood (SC) Index-Journal, Mar. 28, 1984]

DR. BENJAMIN E. MAYS DIES AT 89 IN ATLANTA

ATLANTA (AP).—Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, a nationally known civil rights leader and educator who once said he "never let race beat me down," died today at an Atlanta hospital. He was 89.

Charles Delane, a spokesman for Hughes Spalding Community Hospital, said Mays died about 7:20 a.m. The elderly educator was admitted to the hospital Sunday and "had been in declining health for some time," he said.

Mays had been treated at the hospital in January for pneumonia.

Born Aug. 1, 1894, in Epworth, S.C., Mays was the son of a black man born nine years before the Emancipation Proclamation.

He was best known as the former president of Atlanta's predominantly black Morehouse College and former president of the Atlanta Board of Education.

"Dr. Mays was truly a legend in higher education," said a prepared statement issued by Morehouse today. "He also was a confidant of many U.S. presidents and other heads of state. He touched and influenced the lives of so many men and women during his lifetime..."

"Dr. Mays was an outstanding builder of men, men of character and integrity who went on to hold influential positions in all phases of American society," the statement said.

During his lifetime, Mays received many honors, including at least 45 honorary degrees in law, divinity and the humanities from colleges and universities across the nation, and more than 200 awards and plaques.

He served on the board of numerous colleges and the Martin Luther King Jr. Center for Social Change in Atlanta.

One of his most recent honors was his induction in January into the South Carolina Hall of Fame, when former President Jimmy Carter said in a videotape presentation that Mays was "a credit to Georgia and South Carolina. He's a credit to the Southland and he's a credit to America and the world."

In that same videotape, Mays, who was presented a plaque by Carter, said, "I was born a little stubborn on the race issue. No

man has the right to look down on another man. I never let race beat me down."

Mays was a champion of the civil rights movement in the South and a quiet but persistent thorn in the white conscience.

In his 27 years as president of Morehouse College, he met regularly with students, listened and exchanged ideas which helped mold the lives of those he taught.

His most famous student was Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., the late civil rights leader who was assassinated on April 4, 1968. At one time King called Mays "my spiritual mentor and my intellectual father." On the day of King's funeral, Mays eulogized King as a son, "so close and so precious was he to me."

Georgia State Sen. Julian Bond, another of Mays' students, said at the South Carolina ceremony, "I am kneeling at the feet of a giant. Making friends of enemies has been a lifelong mission of Benjamin Mays."

In March 1960 a group of Atlanta University students told Mays they planned to begin sit-ins designed to open lunch counters to blacks. The confrontation spread to the schools, where the struggle to integrate in Georgia dragged on for 18 months.

In 1961, Mays cited the admittance of two black students to the University of Georgia as the end of diehard resistance to integrated schools. At the same time, he urged black colleges to recruit whites.

Mays retired from Morehouse in 1967 and was elected to the Atlanta Board of Education at the age of 75. In 1970, he was elected chairman of the school board. He stepped down from that post in 1981.

He was an honor graduate of Bates College in Lewiston, Maine, and received his master's degree and Ph.D. from the University of Chicago. He was a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

Mays also was the author of many books, including "Born to Rebel," a study covering three-quarters of a century of black-white relations in the United States.

[From the Columbia (SC) State, Jan. 7, 1984]

EDUCATOR MAYS, POET RUTLEDGE INDUCTED INTO HALL OF FAME

MYRTLE BEACH (AP).—Benjamin E. Mays, who devoted his life to helping men live in peace, and Archibald Rutledge, whose writings helped generations find peace within themselves, were inducted into the South Carolina Hall of Fame during ceremonies here Friday.

The 89-year-old Mays, a Greenwood native and the son of former slaves, worked long years to advance the cause of civil rights during his career as an educator and college president.

Rutledge, who wrote his first poem at age 3 and left a long legacy of prose and poetry, served as South Carolina's first poet laureate for 39 years until his death in 1973.

A crowd of about 1,000 applauded warmly after seeing a videotape in which former President Jimmy Carter visited Mays' Atlanta Home to present a plaque marking his induction.

Mays was hospitalized in Atlanta Tuesday with pneumonia. He was listed in stable condition Friday in the intensive care unit of the Grady Memorial Hospital's Hughes-Spaulding Pavilion.

"He's a credit to Georgia and South Carolina, he's a credit to the Southland and he's a credit to the United States of America and

to the world," said Carter, who is a close personal friend of Mays.

The former president said during the tape that Mays was being recognized for a life "still full, still vigorous and with a great future of service to his fellow men and women—black and white, Americans and those throughout the world."

"I was born a little stubborn on the race issue," replied Mays, a former president of the United Negro College Fund who served as president of Morehouse College in Atlanta for 27 years.

"I felt that no man had a right to look down on another man. Every man, whether he's on the right of you, the left of you, certainly in back of you—it makes no difference—is still a man."

Georgia state Sen. Julian Bond, a student under Mays at Morehouse, said during Friday's ceremonies that "among all things, Dr. Mays is a teacher."

[From the Anderson (SC) Independent-Mail, Nov. 7, 1981]

CIVIL RIGHTS LEADER MAYS HONORED (By Charles Bennett)

GREENWOOD.—A mere 600 feet from the tin-roofed shack in which he was born and raised, civil rights leader and black educator Benjamin E. Mays was honored Friday in a ceremony here designating the intersection of Scott Ferry Road and U.S. 178 as "Mays Crossing."

Delivering remarks was Coretta Scott King, widow of slain civil rights leader Martin Luther King Jr.

"I invited myself to this ceremony before they had a chance to invite me," Mrs. King said. "This is a very historically significant occasion in the life of one of the great men of our time."

"Many of the black leaders of today have been influenced by you," Mrs. King said to the man whom her husband referred to as his spiritual mentor and intellectual father. "I'm personally very pleased that your state has chosen to honor you. You are deserving of this and every other honor which you have received."

Also speaking were Sen. John Drummond, D-Greenwood; Rep. Jennings G. McAbee, D-McCormick; Paul Cobb, chief commissioner of the state highway department; Larry A. Jackson, president of Lander College; Maceo Nance, president of S.C. State College, a predominantly black school in Orangeburg; and former U.S. Rep. W. J. Bryan Dorn of Greenwood.

"We are not here to necessarily honor Dr. Mays but more to remind us of the message and the quality of his life," Jackson said.

In accepting the honor, Mays responded, "I'm happy. I'm glad, I'm extremely proud that my native state has done so much to honor Benjamin Elijah Mays, son of soil, son of slaves."

In his remarks, Mays told of the many changes he has seen in the state. "I was 52 years old before I was allowed to vote," he recalled. "Yes, people have changed for the better in my native state."

"The only way I can explain my presence here today is that God must have been in it. There is no way I could have done what I've done on my own. I do not take credit. I attribute it to God."

Mays' niece, Nettie Powell of Washington, D.C., unveiled the marker designating the intersection as Mays Crossing.

After the ceremony, Mays, Mrs. King and other members of the entourage lunched at Dorn's rural estate near Greenwood. Mrs. King, a leader in the Atlanta-based Martin

Luther King Center for Non-Violent Social Change, declined comment after the ceremony.

Mays was born in 1894 to former slaves S. Hezekiah and Louvenia Mays. He received his high school education from the high school department of S.C. State College. In 1920, he graduated with honors from Bates College in Lewiston, Maine.

A moderating influence in Atlanta politics for many years, Mays resigned from the presidency of the Atlanta Board of Education this year after a 12-year tenure.

Mays has led a varied life through many of the nation's institutes of higher education since his boyhood days in Greenwood.

He worked as a Pullman railroad car porter while working on his master's degree from the University of Chicago, which he received in 1925, and his doctorate in 1935. He holds 49 honorary degrees in 22 states and Africa.

His credits as an educator include president of Morehouse College in Atlanta for 27 years, after which he was elected president emeritus; dean of the school of religion at Howard University, Washington, D.C., from 1934-40; and chairman of board of trustees at Benedict College, Columbia.

He also is a board of trustees member of the King Center and a member of the board of the United Negro College Fund. He served as co-chairman of the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty and as a trustee of the Danforth Foundation and the National Fund for Medical Education.

In July, Gov. Dick Riley awarded him the "Order of the Palmetto" during ceremonies unveiling Dr. Mays' portrait in the state capitol.

A 3-HOUR ORDEAL ON ST. MAARTEN ISLAND

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, a most disturbing incident happened earlier this month involving two of my constituents who were visiting St. Maarten Island in the West Indies. I would like to bring the incident to the Senate's attention and comment upon it briefly.

Barbara and Susan Caldwell, the wife and daughter, respectively, of prominent Maine writer Bill Caldwell, were held at knifepoint in their car for more than 3 hours by a mob of 500 onlookers while they were vacationing on the French part of the island. This bizarre and violent incident should never have been allowed to take place, and it has raised serious questions about the adequacy of efforts by the French police to protect American citizens who visit the island.

Barbara and Susan Caldwell were fortunate to have emerged from this terrifying incident unharmed. But the question must be asked: Will others visiting the island be similarly fortunate? I have asked the State Department to review this matter, and have lodged a strong protest with French authorities as well.

Mr. Caldwell wrote a gripping article about this attack which appeared in a recent edition of the Maine Sunday Telegram, and I ask unanimous consent that the article appear in the

RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Maine Sunday Telegram, Apr. 15, 1984]

DMARISCOTTA WOMEN TERRORIZED ON ST. MAARTEN

The following was written by Sunday Telegram columnist Bill Caldwell after his wife and daughter's return to Maine.

A Maine mother and daughter were held at knifepoint in their car for three hours, surrounded by a mob of 500 onlookers, on the French part of St. Maarten Island last week, while vacationing in the West Indies. Barbara B. Caldwell and her daughter Susan of Damariscotta, arrived home in Maine after the ordeal. They are the wife and daughter of newspaper columnist Bill Caldwell.

"French police and French army patrols came to the riot scene three times, but did absolutely nothing to rescue us," said Susan. "When we were finally allowed to leave our damaged car, we found the French police waiting in safety on a nearby street, till the incident was over."

Sen. William S. Cohen said Thursday that he would make a statement on the Senate floor complaining that French authorities had failed to assist American citizens when their lives were in danger. Cohen said he would also ask the State Department to register an official complaint with the French Embassy in Washington.

Barbara and Susan Caldwell described their three-hour ordeal. "We were driving up a narrow street in the French town of Marigot, when our car was stopped by a man armed with a knife and a broken-off beer bottle who blocked our way. By his long hair, which was done in long 'dreadlocks' reaching almost to his waist, we could see he was a member of the Rastafarian sect, a religious group which uses marijuana as part of their daily ritual."

"The man was bloodied around the neck and head and seemed drugged or deranged. He threatened us with his knife and bottle, and shouted to us to turn off the engine."

Mrs. Caldwell said that four or five other men, all seemingly Rastafarians, circled the car. "Soon a crowd surrounded us, numbering finally about 500 people. We closed the car windows and locked the doors, and my daughter and I sat absolutely still, not daring to make any sudden move."

After the crowd had assembled, the French police arrived on the scene. "We hoped they had come to rescue us. But they spoke only briefly to the assailant and then left."

Acting on a suggestion from an onlooker, Miss Caldwell tried to start the car and inch forward. "Then the assailant jumped on the hood of the car, tore off the windshield wipers and tried to knock in the windows with his fists," said Mrs. Caldwell. "So we stopped the car again and shut off the engine." After another hour had passed and the crowd had drawn closely around the car, they began to rock the car on its wheels. "We were scared they would turn us over and that we were in immediate danger."

Once again the French police came and went away. Then a French army patrol came in a vehicle, looked the scene over and left, according to Mrs. Caldwell.

"Our assailant became enraged again and took his knife and slashed the tires on the car, so we could not possibly move."

He jumped onto the hood and began banging on the roof and on the windshield and the side windows, shouting what sounded like "Kill me! Kill me!"

The heat inside the closed car became intense after the second hour, said Mrs. Caldwell. "It was 85 degrees outside. Inside it must have been close to 120 degrees."

The time was now close to 6 in the evening and the women began to worry what might happen to them when it got dark.

"Then we saw two huge black men by the car, rapping on the window. We rolled it down an inch," Mrs. Caldwell said. "They said they wanted us to get out. We agreed to get out, but only if they could get us safely through the mob. They said they would do their best and urged us to make a slow, easy move out of the car. We did. The two men virtually surrounded my daughter and me and got us safely through the crowd. When we reached a side street, we found the French gendarmes waiting in their car. When I asked why they had not helped us, they shrugged and laughed."

Mrs. Caldwell and her daughter were driven by their rescuers to their guest house on the Dutch side of the border. The house is owned by Earle and Betty Vaughan, formerly of Fryeburg, Maine. A telephone call to the Vaughans revealed that the Island Governing Council met Thursday to discuss how to avoid a repetition of this kind of incident. The council urged hotels and stores on the Dutch part of the island to advise tourists not to travel to the French section of the island. Local sources on St. Maartens say that an election is due to take place on the French part of the island in May and that the demonstration by the Rastafarians may have had political motives. The Caldwells say they have received apologies from the Dutch governor and the Dutch Minister of Tourism.

"We would go back to the Netherlands Antilles again tomorrow, given the chance. . . . But we would stay away from the French part of the island and advise other Americans to give it a clear berth," said Mrs. Caldwell.

THE SHIPPING ACT OF 1984

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, on February 23, 1984, this body passed, by a vote of 74 to 12, potentially the most significant maritime legislation in decades. Shortly thereafter on March 1, 1984, in a White House ceremony, S. 47, the Shipping Act of 1984, became Public Law 98-237.

By clarifying the extent of antitrust immunity for ocean shipping, by streamlining the regulatory process and creating new shipper-carrier relationships, we sought to develop a more efficient international ocean transportation system. During the years of extensive debate and negotiations in the House and Senate over the course of the 97th and 98th Congresses, however, some questioned whether the Shipping Act legislation would actually produce this result.

Thus, I was particularly gratified to read in the April 3, 1984, edition of the Journal of Commerce a statement

issued by Kiyoshi Kumagai, president of the Japanese Shipowners' Association. According to the report:

Mr. Kumagai, who admitted that the purpose of the American law—the Shipping Act—is to attempt to reconstitute a free and influential merchant marine, cautioned that for Japanese owners the result will be a necessity for new efforts to strive for cost reductions in servicing U.S. trade routes.

It is necessary, to devote all energies to achieving cost reductions to survive in the U.S. trade.

Mr. President, this is precisely the result that those of us who worked so hard on this legislation over the past several years were seeking. When the Japanese Shipowners' Association talks about reducing its costs in servicing U.S. trade routes, it is talking about reducing the costs of ocean transportation for U.S. exports and imports. The logical result of reduced transportation costs is the increased competitiveness of our products in foreign markets, and reduced costs for our consumers for imported goods.

Our goal was a more efficient ocean transportation system, and I am delighted that the providers of much of that ocean transportation are acknowledging that this will, indeed, be the result.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING THE ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of April 12, 1984, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 13, April 17, April 18, April 19, and April 23, 1984, received messages from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations and treaties; which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations and treaties received on April 13, April 17, April 18, April 19, and April 23, 1984, are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING THE ADJOURNMENT—PM 129

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of April 12, 1984, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 13, 1984, received the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, I am pleased to transmit herewith the 18th Annual Report of the Nation-

al Endowment for the Humanities covering the year 1983.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 13, 1984.

ANNUAL REPORT ON THE TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING THE ADJOURNMENT—PM 130

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of April 12, 1984, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 17, during the adjournment of the Senate, received the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Section 163(a) of the Trade Act of 1974, I hereby transmit the Twenty-seventh Annual Report on the Trade Agreements Program 1983.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 17, 1984.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY, MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING THE ADJOURNMENT—PM 131

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of April 12, 1984, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 17, 1984, during the adjournment of the Senate, received the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Section 7104(e) of Title 5, United States Code, I hereby transmit the Fifth Annual Report of the Federal Labor Relations Authority which covers Fiscal Year 1983.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 17, 1984.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on April 13, 1984, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled joint resolution:

S.J. Res. 173. Joint resolution commending the Historic American Buildings Survey, a program of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, the Library of Congress, and the American Institute of Architects.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of April 13, 1984, the following reports of committees were submitted on April 18, 1984:

By Mr. PERCY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 4504: A bill to provide that the chairmanship of the Commission of Security and Cooperation in Europe shall rotate between Members appointed from the House of Representatives and Members appointed from the Senate (Rept. No. 98-398).

By Mr. DOMENICI, from the Committee on the Budget, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 106: An original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987 and revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1984 (Rept. No. 98-399).

By Mr. PERCY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 2582: An original bill to provide a supplemental authorization of appropriations for the fiscal year 1984 for certain foreign assistance programs; to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Arms Export Control Act, and other acts to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1985 for international security and development assistance, for the Peace Corps, and the International Development Association, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-400).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, with amendments:

S. 2311: A bill to amend the provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to health maintenance organizations (Rept. No. 98-401).

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2061: A bill to declare certain lands held by the Seneca Nation of Indians to be part of the Allegany Reservation in the State of New York (Rept. No. 98-402).

S. 2468: A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Makah Indian Tribe, Washington (Rept. No. 98-403).

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1979: A bill to confirm the boundaries of the Southern Ute Indian Reservation in the State of Colorado and to define jurisdiction within such reservation (Rept. No. 98-404).

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1196: A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Claims Court with respect to certain claims of the Navajo Indian Tribe (Rept. No. 98-405).

S. 1967: A bill to compensate the Gros Ventre and Assiniboine Tribes of the Fort Belknap Indian Community for irrigation construction expenditures (Rept. No. 98-406).

S. 2177: A bill to provide for the use and distribution of the Lake Superior and Mississippi Bands of Chippewa Indians judgment funds in Docket 18-S and the Lake Superior Band of Chippewa Indians judgment funds in Docket 18-U, before the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-407).

S. 2184: A bill to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to impose certain limitations with respect to the administration of such act and to authorize appropriations under such act for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-408).

S. 2403: A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Pueblo de Cochiti (Rept. No. 98-409).

By Mr. PERCY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. Res. 371: An original resolution waiving section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to the consideration of S. 2582.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 2000: A bill to allow variable interest rates for Indian funds held in trust by the United States (Rept. No. 98-410).

By Mr. DOMENICI, from the Committee on the Budget, without amendment:

S. Res. 361: Resolution waiving section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to the consideration of H.R. 71.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

Louis Roman Disabato, of Texas, to be a Member of the National Museum Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 1987; Ingrid Azvedo, of California, to be a Member of the Federal Council on Aging for a term expiring June 5, 1985;

Nelda Ann Lambert Barton, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Federal Council on the Aging for a term expiring June 5, 1986;

Edna Bogosian, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Council on the Aging for a term expiring June 5, 1986;

James N. Broder, of Maine, to be a Member of the Federal Council on the Aging for a term expiring June 5, 1986;

Tony Guglielmo, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the Federal Council on Aging for a term expiring June 5, 1986; and

Frances Lamont, of South Dakota, to be a Member of the Federal Council on the Aging for a term expiring June 5, 1986.

(The above nominations were reported from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources with the recommendation that they be confirmed, subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PERCY (by request):
S. 2583. A bill to authorize United States participation in the "Office International de

la Vigne et du Vin" (the International Office of the Vine and Wine); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PACKWOOD:

S. 2584. A bill to provide authorization of appropriations for activities carried out under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BENTSEN (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. MOYNIHAN):

S. 2585. A bill to encourage the use of native flowers in highway landscaping; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. NICKLES:

S. 2586. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States a reversionary interest held by the United States in certain lands located in Payne County, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry.

By Mr. CRANSTON (for himself and Mr. WILSON):

S. 2587. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to the city of San Diego, Calif., for construction of publicly owned treatment works in the city of San Diego which will provide primary treatment of municipal sewage and industrial wastes for the city of Tijuana, Mex.; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. TRIBLE):

S.J. Res. 277. Joint resolution to authorize the Armed Force Monument Committee, the United States Armor Association, the World War Tank Corps Association, the Veterans of the Battle of the Bulge, and the 1st, 4th, 8th, 9th, 11th, 14th, and 16th Armored Division Associations jointly to erect a memorial to the "American Armored Force" on U.S. Government property in Arlington, Va., and for the other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. QUAYLE (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S.J. Res. 278. Joint resolution to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Bureau of Labor Statistics; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PERCY (by request):

S. 2583. A bill to authorize U.S. participation in the Office International de la Vigne et du Vin—the International Office of the Vine and Wine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INTERNATIONAL OFFICE OF THE VINE AND WINE

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize U.S. participation in the International Office of the Vine and Wine.

This legislation has been requested by the Department of State and I am introducing the proposed legislation in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggest-

ed amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Foreign Relations Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with a section-by-section analysis of the bill and the letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs to the President of the Senate dated April 6, 1984.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2583

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized to maintain membership of the United States in the Office International de la Vigne et du Vin (the International Office of the Vine and Wine).

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

This Bill authorizes the President to maintain United States membership in the Office International de la Vigne et du Vin, established in 1924 by an intergovernmental agreement to which the United States Government has recently acceded. This Organization is widely recognized as the most prestigious and influential intergovernmental organization devoted to international wine technology, industry and trade issues concerning its member states, and membership therein is in the interest of the United States as one of the major wine-producing countries. Permanent legislative authorization of this nature is consistent with 22 U.S.C. §§ 262 and 2672, relating to United States participation in international congresses, conferences and organizations. Annual cost to maintain our membership is expected to be approximately \$15,000 at current exchange rates.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC, April 6, 1984.

HON. GEORGE BUSH,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The United States Government has been invited to join the Office International de la Vigne et du Vin (International Office of the Vine and Wine-O.I.V.V.), the most prestigious and influential intergovernmental organization devoted to wine technology and international trade issues concerning wine. Because of the volume of U.S. international trade in wine, the potential for greatly expanding U.S. exports of wine and the O.I.V.V.'s influence in the international wine industry and trade, the Administration believes the U.S. should join the O.I.V.V.

The O.I.V.V. was established in Paris in 1924 by an intergovernmental agreement and currently has 31 State Members including the principal wine producing and consuming countries. It addresses economic, technical and scientific issues of the wine industry with the objective of reducing barriers to trade, harmonizing national practices and reducing fraud. O.I.V.V. decisions, policies and recommendations on these issues, although non-binding, are nonetheless given serious consideration by Member States and are frequently reflected in their national legislation and trade initiatives.

The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (BATF) has by invitation, participated informally as an observer in O.I.V.V. symposia

and general assembly meetings since 1980. However, because the United States has not been a member, our representatives have not been entitled to attend closed committee meetings, where O.I.V.V. positions are formulated, or to vote. We believe United States interests can no longer be adequately represented through such limited informal participation.

For these reasons, I hereby transmit a bill to authorize the President to maintain membership of the United States in the Office International de la Vigne et du Vin (the International Office of the Vine and Wine). Annual cost to maintain our membership is expected to be approximately \$15,000 at current exchange rates.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that from the standpoint of the Administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress.

With cordial regards,

W. TAPLEY BENNETT, JR.,

Assistant Secretary,

Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs.

By Mr. PACKWOOD:

S. 2584. A bill to provide authorization of appropriations for activities carried out under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ACTIVITIES UNDER THE MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION ACT

● Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to provide for the reauthorization of the Marine Mammal Protection Act for fiscal years 1985, 1986, 1987, and 1988.

Although I fully expect that in its final form this reauthorization legislation will contain several amendments to the act, at this point I am only offering a clean reauthorization bill. The Senate Commerce Committee will be holding hearings on the bill shortly, and it is at that time, that we will fully air the concerns of all interested parties regarding needed amendments.

I should point out, however, that it is my sincere hope that we will be able to hold amendments to a minimum. The act was subject to major revisions during the last reauthorization cycle in 1981, and I do not feel that we need to again review all aspects of our domestic marine mammal research and conservation efforts.

In addition, I am approaching this reauthorization with the view that we should not take any steps which could be construed as weakening the act. Many Americans are already concerned that the integrity of our environmental laws is in doubt. I do not want to exacerbate this perception. Therefore, only changes which it can be argued are truly needed will be considered during this reauthorization process.

As far as timing is concerned, it is my intent to report a reauthorization bill on May 8. Whether or not that bill will contain all possible amendments is subject to conjecture, but I do want to

make sure we meet the May 15 Budget Committee deadline.

I hope my colleagues will support this measure when it is brought back to the Senate later this year. I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2584

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to improve the operation of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, and for other purposes," approved October 9, 1981 (16 U.S.C. 1384(a)), is amended—

(1) by striking "and" immediately after "1983,"; and

(2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: " \$9,300,000 for fiscal year 1985, \$9,800,000 for fiscal year 1986, \$10,300,000, for fiscal year 1987, and \$10,800,000 for fiscal year 1988".

(b) Section 7(b) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1384(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" immediately after "1983,"; and

(2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: " \$2,300,000 for fiscal year 1985, \$2,400,000 for fiscal year 1986, \$2,500,000 for fiscal year 1987, and \$2,650,000 for fiscal year 1988".

(c) Section 7(c) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1407(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" immediately after "1983,"; and

(2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: " \$1,155,000 for fiscal year 1985, \$1,225,000 for fiscal year 1986, \$1,275,000 for fiscal year 1987, and \$1,325,000 for fiscal year 1988".

By Mr. BENTSEN (for himself,
Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. MOYNIHAN):

S. 2585. A bill to encourage the use of native wildflowers in highway landscaping; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

USE OF WILDFLOWERS IN HIGHWAY LANDSCAPING

● Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, a few years ago, an insightful and progressive first lady gave us a vision of how natural beauty could be enjoyed along our Nation's highways. Lady Bird Johnson carefully jarred us out of our preoccupation with manmade eyesores and helped us move in the direction of appreciating and conserving the natural beauty of this great country. One of her memorable acts was to encourage the regulation of billboards along our highways. This not only removed a constant barrage of stationary salesmen but in most instances allowed us to see and enjoy the natural scenic beauty theretofore hidden. Lady Bird Johnson was not content to stop there. She recognized that as Americans continued their move out of cities, more and more of the countryside was being covered with shopping malls, housing subdivisions, and freeways, thus destroying natural grasses and flowers.

With her usual enthusiasm she led the movement to beautify America with the planting and cultivation of colorful and hardy native wildflowers. Her artistry is vividly displayed in the Nation's Capital where the yellows, reds, and pinks of well placed traditional and wild flowers attract the visual senses. It is with these images in mind that I introduce this bill to open to millions more of Americans the national beauty of our great country and continue the perpetuation of native wildflowers and vegetation. Often it has been our highways which have desecrated the landscape and this bill gives us an opportunity to replace and even enhance the environment along these roadways.

I am also motivated to introduce this bill by the experience gained in Texas as they have progressively pursued the planting of wildflowers along the highways in the State. These efforts have demonstrated the cost-cutting, water-saving, labor-saving benefits of blending wildflowers into highway landscaping. The Texas Highway Department proved that where wildflowers have been planted, mowing along highway right-of-way in 24 Texas counties reduced costs by 24.8 percent and actually enhanced the native vegetation. Projected statewide, the program significantly reduced the State's annual \$32 million cost of mowing by \$8 million. Wildflower landscapes also make possible a substantial reduction in annual applications of water, from as many as 20 to 30 to 5 or 6. Projecting the possible cost reductions nationwide I am sure it is obvious the savings would be significantly proportionate, thus freeing millions of dollars for other roadbuilding and rebuilding work. It is also important to note that Texas has learned the problem of litter is greatly reduced where wildflowers have been planted along the highways. Travelers are evidently more reluctant to throw litter onto an attractive landscape.

With the implementation of this bill millions of people each day who travel on our Nation's highways would have the opportunity to be uplifted by the unique contribution of wildflowers indigenous to the part of the country through which they are traveling. At the same time the wildflowers would represent millions of dollars saved during a time when State and Federal budgets are requiring careful cost-cutting efforts. I hope we may join together in following the lead of Lady Bird Johnson in beautifying our Nation's highways and conserving a national resource, while contributing to significant financial savings.●

By Mr. NICKLES:

S. 2586. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States a reversionary interest held by the United States in cer-

tain lands located in Payne County, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

RELEASE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN PAYNE COUNTY, OK

● Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, on March 30, 1984, I introduced a bill, S. 2511, which would have the effect of lifting a "public use" reversionary clause from one parcel of land now owned by Oklahoma State University and placing that public use restriction on a separate parcel of land owned by the university. The reversionary clause is held currently by the United States. I would like to refer my colleagues to page 7213 of the March 30 RECORD for more background on this legislation.

Today I am reintroducing this legislation with the addition of a section 3 to the bill which deals with the mineral rights underlying the tract of land from which the public use surface restriction is intended to be lifted. The United States owns 75 percent of the mineral interests and the university owns the remaining 25 percent interests. This new section is designed to protect the surface uses of land from any possible adverse effects caused by the exploration and development of the underlying minerals, if any, that exist.

This protection can be accomplished in two ways. First, the university is given the option of purchasing the mineral interests of the United States at fair market value. In the alternative, if the university decides not to purchase those mineral interests, the Department of Interior could only lease or convey its mineral interests to a third party if such lease or conveyance prohibited surface occupancy of the mineral developer, if such occupancy would interfere with the surface or intended surface uses of the land.

I thank the Chair and ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2586

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, (a) subject to section 2, the Secretary of Agriculture shall release, on behalf of the United States, with respect to the tracts of land described in subsection (b), the condition contained in a deed dated December 13, 1954, and recorded on December 21, 1954, in deed book 155 DR beginning at page 125 in the land records of Payne County, Oklahoma, and as corrected by a Correction Deed dated December 31, 1963, and recorded on January 13, 1964, in deed book 184 DR beginning at page 465 in the aforesaid land records, between the United States of America and the Board of Regents for the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, subsequently renamed Oklahoma State University, conveying certain tracts of land, of which such described tracts of land are a

part, to such university, which requires that the tracts of land conveyed be used for public purposes and revert back to the United States should the tracts of land cease to be used for such purposes.

(b) The tracts of land referred to in subsection (a) are described as follows: Approximately 960 acres, more or less, located at Indian Base Meridian; Township 19 North; Range 1 East; and as more fully delineated in the agreement entered into in accordance with section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture shall release the condition referred to in section 1(a) of this Act only with respect to land covered by and described in an agreement entered into between the Secretary and the Board of Regents of Oklahoma State University in which the university, in consideration of the release of such condition, agrees to transfer such condition to other lands containing approximately equal acreage owned by the university and to specify such lands in the agreement.

SEC. 3. (a) Subsequent to any release executed by the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the tracts of land described in section 1(b) of this Act, the Oklahoma State University may apply to the Secretary of the Interior seeking to acquire all the undivided mineral interests of the United States in the tracts of land to which such release applies, and the Secretary of the Interior shall, subject to valid existing rights and subject to subsection (b) of this section, convey such mineral interests as requested.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall not convey the undivided mineral interest of the United States in any land as requested in an application filed by the Oklahoma State University under subsection (a) of this section unless—

(1) such application is accompanied by a sum of money which the Secretary of the Interior determines is necessary to pay the administrative costs involved in conveying such mineral interests to the University, including the costs of determining the mineral character of such land and the costs of establishing the fair market value of such mineral interest, and

(2) the University, in consideration of such conveyance, pays to the Secretary of the Interior—

(A) \$1, in the case of any such land determined by the Secretary of the Interior to have no mineral value and to be under no active mineral development or leasing, or

(B) the fair market value of such mineral interests, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, in the case of any such land not subject to clause (A) of this subsection.

(c) Except as provided in subsection (a) and (b) above, the Secretary of the Interior shall not convey or lease the undivided mineral interest of the United States with respect to any tracts of land upon which the Secretary of Agriculture executes a release in accordance with this Act unless such conveyance or lease prohibits surface occupancy of the land for development of those interests if such surface occupancy would interfere with the surface uses or intended surface uses of the land.●

By Mr. CRANSTON (for himself and Mr. WILSON):

S. 2587. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to the city of San Diego, Calif., for construction of publicly owned treatment works in the city of San Diego which will pro-

vide primary treatment of municipal sewage and industrial wastes for the city of Tijuana, Mexico; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT IN SAN DIEGO, CA

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation—with Senator PETE WILSON as a cosponsor—to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to the city of San Diego, Calif., for the purpose of constructing a facility to treat sewage from Tijuana, Mexico. This legislation is urgently needed to address a critical public health problem in San Diego.

Tijuana now has a sewage facility which handles 5 million gallons of sewage a day. But this plant breaks down on a regular basis and raw sewage runs down from the watershed and is transported into the United States via the Tijuana River, creating an immediate public health problem in San Diego. On several occasions the San Diego area beaches have had to be closed for the public's protection.

Actually only half the households in Tijuana are hooked up to any sewage collection system at all, and for the past 3 years San Diego has been treating as much of Tijuana's sewage as the city can, about 13 million gallons per day. The pressures of Tijuana's system will get worse as additional households hook up to the city's system and as the city's population grows.

Mexico is taking steps to complete by the end of this year a 60 million gallon per day pumping plant to replace two old plants. Additionally Tijuana has installed a 42-inch pressure line to replace two old parallel lines and has upgraded its open conveyance canal which is carrying effluent to the ocean. But more work must be done to stop the flow of raw sewage into San Diego. This is an international situation and the U.S. Government must take corrective action.

The legislation being introduced today would provide \$55 million in Federal funds to build a barebones treatment facility—the minimum necessary to eliminate the public health problem. The legislation would require that the facility be built to the construction standards required under the Clean Water Act. It would also direct the State Department to enter negotiations with Mexico to seek contributions toward the plant's construction and operation and maintenance.

Mr. President, the population of Tijuana is increasing as is the population of San Diego. By the year 2000, there may well be a need for a larger facility providing a higher level of treatment—up to 100 million gallons per day for Tijuana and up to 30 million gallons per day for San Diego. This legislation does not provide for a sewage treatment plant of that size. At the same time, it does not preclude future legis-

lation for that purpose. The option would remain open.

Mr. President, it is my hope that the Senate will have the opportunity to consider this matter before the 98th Congress adjourns. The Tijuana/San Diego sewage problem is serious and needs attention this year.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That

(a) Upon application of the City of San Diego, California, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Administrator") shall make grants to such city for construction of publicly owned treatment works in such city to provide primary treatment for up to 60 million gallons per day of municipal sewage and industrial waste for the City of Tijuana, Mexico.

(b) The project design for such treatment works must be approved by the Administrator, and such treatment works shall be constructed to meet the provisions of section 204(a) and (d), section 212, and section 217 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act which would be applicable if such treatment works were being constructed under section 201 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

(c) The Department of State shall enter into negotiations with the government of Mexico to seek contributions towards the capital costs of the primary treatment works and payment of user fees to cover the costs of operation and maintenance of such treatment works. In the absence of funding being provided by the government of Mexico, the Department of State shall pay the necessary costs.

(d) For fiscal years commencing after September 30, 1984, there is authorized to be appropriated \$55,000,000 to implement the provisions of this Act.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. TRIBLE):

S.J. Res. 277. Joint resolution to authorize the Armed Forces Monument Committee, the U.S. Armor Association, the World Wars Tank Corps Association, the Veterans of the Battle of the Bulge, and the 1st, 4th, 8th, 9th, 11th, 14th, and 16th Armored Division Associations jointly to erect a memorial to the "American Armored Force" on U.S. Government property in Arlington, VA, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEMORIAL TO THE AMERICAN ARMORED FORCE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, joined by my distinguished colleagues from Virginia, Senators WARNER and TRIBLE, I am pleased today to introduce a joint resolution to authorize the erection of a memorial in Arlington, Va., for the purpose of honoring those men of "flesh and steel" of the "American Armored Force" who have honorably served this country as mem-

bers of its armored forces during World Wars I and II, Korea, and Vietnam, as well as those who are currently serving in comparable fighting units worldwide.

This memorial would be erected at no cost to the Government. It would be placed on U.S. Government property in Arlington, Va., between the Arlington Memorial Bridge and the entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery and beside Memorial Drive.

Mr. President, this proposal has the endorsement, among others, of the Armored Force Monument Committee and its eminent chairman, Gen. Bruce C. Clarke (U.S. Army, retired). It has the support of the U.S. Armor Association, the World Wars Tank Corps Association, the Veterans of the Battle of the Bulge, and the 1st, 4th, 8th, 9th, 11th, 14th and 16th Armored Division Associations.

Simply stated, this joint resolution would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to select, with the approval of the National Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Commission, a suitable site for this memorial.

Private donors would assume the cost of the erection of the monument. The only expense to the U.S. Government would be that incurred by the Interior Department for the maintenance and care of the memorial area.

Mr. President, one of the finest chapters in the epic history of the U.S. Army, has been the story of the "American Armored Force." This great "American Armored Force" had its beginning when Gen. "Black Jack" Pershing established the U.S. Army Tank Corps during World War I. Col. George Patton commanded one of the first tank brigades at the time when the Yankee tankers received their first baptism of fire in the battle of St. Mihiel. Between the two World Wars, U.S. Army visionaries, like Gen. Van Voorhis and Gen. Adna Chaffee, labored mightily to mechanize and modernize the U.S. Army. In January 1940, Gen. George C. Marshall brought fruition to their labors by creating the "American Armored Force."

It was this "American Armored Force" that provided the powerful armored units. This force was composed of armored divisions, mechanized cavalry groups, separate armored field artillery, tank destroyer and tank and armored infantry battalions, all of which contributed substantially to the victory of American arms in all the theaters of war in World War II.

Mr. President, this is the same "American Armored Force" that provided the basis of the armored infantry, armored cavalry, armored artillery, armored engineers, armored signal and tank units that were an integral part of the success as achieved by our forces in the many battles

fought in the Korean and Vietnam wars.

It is an honor and a personal pleasure for me, along with my colleagues, Senators WARNER and TRIBLE, to introduce this joint resolution to authorize the erection of a monument honoring the "American Armored Force." This memorial will signify permanent recognition by a grateful nation for heroic achievements in combat against aggression. I urge that this measure be given early and favorable consideration.

By Mr. QUAYLE (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S.J. Res. 278. Joint resolution to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Bureau of Labor Statistics; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

● Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. President, today I am introducing a joint resolution to commemorate and nationally recognize the 100th anniversary of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor. I am pleased to have as cosponsors to this bill, Senators HATCH, KENNEDY, and RANDOLPH.

On June 27, 1984, President Chester A. Arthur signed into law legislation establishing the Federal Bureau of Labor, now known as the Bureau of Labor Statistics, whose mission was and is to "collect information upon the subject of labor, its relation to capital, the hours of labor, and the earnings of laboring men and women, and the means of promoting their material, social, intellectual, and moral prosperity."

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) has completed a century of service as one of the principal data-gathering agencies of the Federal Government. In the broad field of labor economics, BLS has the formidable responsibility for collecting, processing, analyzing and disseminating data relating to the labor force and the performance of the economy including employment, unemployment, prices and family expenditures, wages and other worker compensation, industrial relations, productivity and technological change and occupational safety and health.

BLS pursues these responsibilities with integrity and is unfailingly responsive to the need for new types of information. The Bureau organizes and collates data in useful statistical forms. The information is then presented for public use in official BLS publications such as the Monthly Labor Review, and in press releases, bulletins, and reports as well as through microfiche and new electronic services. Labor, industry, and other government agencies rely on data compiled by BLS.

For example, many public programs and private transactions are dependent today on the quality of such Bureau statistics as the unemployment rate and the Consumer Price Index. These statistics play essential roles in the allocation of Federal funds and the adjustment of pensions, welfare, payments, private, contracts and other payments to offset the impact of inflation.

In providing these kinds of crucial information, BLS strives to adhere to certain guiding principles.

The Bureau is committed to objectivity and accuracy in all of its data gathering and interpretive and analytical work. BLS insists on candor at all times, fully disclosing the methods employed in obtaining and analyzing the data, giving clear explanations of the limitations of the data and willingly admitting and correcting errors when they occur.

BLS assures its respondents that the information they provide will be kept confidential and used only for the purpose of statistical compilations. The willingness of employers to cooperate in BLS surveys is in part due to their belief that BLS can be trusted to protect its sources and handle data professionally. Without this trust BLS data would lack credibility and lose its usefulness.

BLS has an ongoing commitment to improving methods of compiling data, including gathering information more efficiently and presenting it more effectively. With the help of other Government agencies the Bureau has worked industriously on problems of statistical methodology in order to improve the quality of information obtained for public purposes and has earned an international reputation as a leader in economic and social statistics.

Throughout its century of service to the Federal Government and the public, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has established and maintained the highest standards of professional competence and commitment. Therefore, we are introducing this joint resolution in order to enable Congress and the President of the United States to give special and public recognition and commendation to the Bureau of Labor Statistics on its 100th anniversary.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 476

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART) was added as a cosponsor of S. 476, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to require a finding of medical improvement when disability benefits are terminated, to provide for a review and right to personal appearance prior to termination of disability benefits, to provide for uniform standards in determining disability, to

provide continued payment of disability benefits during the appeals process, and for other purposes.

S. 1806

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBERGER) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1806, a bill to recognize the organization known as the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, Inc.

S. 2031

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2031, a bill relating to the residence of the American Ambassador to Israel.

S. 2258

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2258, a bill to grant a Federal charter to the 369th Veterans' Association.

S. 2359

At the request of Mr. HEINZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2359, a bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to provide that the jurisdictions having no or few areas where a majority of the residents are persons of low and moderate income target community development block grant funds to those areas with the highest proportion of such persons.

S. 2380

At the request of Mr. HEINZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2380, a bill to reduce unfair practices and provide for orderly trade in certain carbon, alloy, and stainless steel mill products, to reduce unemployment, and for other purposes.

S. 2413

At the request of Mr. DENTON, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2413, a bill to recognize the organization known as the American Gold Star Mothers, Inc.

S. 2456

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2456, a bill to establish a commission to study the 1932-1933 famine caused by the Soviet Government in Ukraine.

S. 2476

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2476, a bill to provide for a pay increase for article III judges subject to salary adjustments pursuant to section 461 of title 28 of the United States Code.

S. 2512

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2512, a bill to establish a program to improve the leadership and management skills of school administrators, and for other purposes.

S. 2579

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2579, a bill to amend subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, relating to currency reports.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 5

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 5, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to Federal budget procedures.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 244

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 244, a joint resolution designating the week beginning on May 6, 1984, as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 257

At the request of Mr. STEVENS, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. DENTON) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 257, a joint resolution to designate the period July 1, 1984, through July 1, 1985, as the "Year of the Ocean."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 258

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BRADLEY), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 258, a joint resolution to designate the week of June 24 through June 30, 1984 as "National Safety in the Workplace Week."

At the request of Mr. CHILES, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABDNOR) were withdrawn as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 258, *supra*.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 267

At the request of Mr. CHILES, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABDNOR) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 267, a joint resolution to designate the week of September 23, 1984, through September 29, 1984, as

"National Drug Abuse Education and Prevention Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 272

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 272, a joint resolution recognizing the anniversaries of the Warsaw Uprising and the Polish resistance to the invasion of Poland during World War II.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 94

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 94, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President of Syria should permit Jewish emigration.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 101

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 101, a concurrent resolution to commemorate the Ukrainian famine of 1933.

SENATE RESOLUTION 367

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. QUAYLE) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 367, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate in support of "Solidarity Sunday."

SENATE RESOLUTION 368

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 368, a resolution condemning chemical warfare wherever it occurs and calling for a ban on chemical weapons.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

IMPROVEMENTS TO RIVERS AND HARBORS

DOMENICI AMENDMENT NO. 3026

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DOMENICI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1739) to authorize the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 137, line 12, after the word "authorized", insert the word "also".

● Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to clarify the intent of the authorization for the Albuquerque Levee project, which is contained in title VII of S. 1739.

The language of the provision in the bill provides to the Corps of Engineers flexibility for controlling flooding at Albuquerque, by granting authority to lower the riverbed by dredging, thus increasing the capacity of the Rio Grande to carry water downstream, as well as authority to raise the levees north and south of Albuquerque.

The addition of the word "also" clarifies the intention of the bill that the Corps of Engineers has the discretion to accomplish either or both aspects of the program, on a cost-effective basis.●

FEDERAL BOAT SAFETY ACT
AMENDMENTSBAKER (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 3027

Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GARN, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. STEVENS) proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 2163) to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 25, line 7 strike "Act." and insert the following: "Act."

TITLE II—CIVIL SERVICE PROGRAMS
COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS UNDER THE CIVIL
SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Sec. 201. (a) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 8340 of title 5, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) the term 'base quarter', as used with respect to a year, means the calendar quarter ending on September 30 of such year; and

"(2) the price index for a base quarter is the arithmetical mean of such index for the 3 months comprising such quarter.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, effective December 1 of each year, each annuity payable from the Fund having a commencing date not later than such December 1 shall be increased by the percent change in the price index for the base quarter of such year over the price index for the base quarter of the latest preceding year in which an increase under this subsection was made, adjusted to the nearest $\frac{1}{10}$ of 1 percent."

(b)(1) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that no adjustment under section 8340(b) of title 5, United States Code (as amended by such subsection), shall be made during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending November 30, 1984.

(2) For purposes of the first increase under subsection (b) of section 8340 of title 5, United States Code (as amended by subsection (a)) after the date of enactment of this Act, an increase under such subsection (as so amended) shall be deemed to have been made effective December 1, 1983.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning with the monthly rate payable for December 1984, any annuity or retired or retirement pay payable under any retirement system for Government officers or employees which the President adjusts pursuant to section 8340(b) of title 5, United

States Code (as amended by subsection (a)), shall hereafter be paid no earlier than the first business day of the succeeding month.

(d) Subsection (b) of section 301 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1982 (96 Stat. 790; 5 U.S.C. 8340 note) is repealed.

PAY COMPARABILITY ADJUSTMENT FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

SEC. 202. (a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of fiscal year 1984, the overall percentage of the adjustment under section 5305 of title 5, United States Code, in the rates of pay under the General Schedule, and in the rates of pay under the other statutory pay systems shall be an increase of 3.5 percent.

(2) The adjustment pursuant to paragraph (1) shall take effect on the first day of the first applicable pay period commencing on or after January 1, 1984.

(b) Section 5305 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by inserting "the first January 1 after" before "October 1";

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (c)(2), by inserting "the first January 1 after" before "October 1"; and

(3) in subsection (m), by striking out "October 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "the first January 1, after October 1 of the applicable year".

(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of a prevailing rate employee described in section 5342 (a)(2) or title 5, United States Code, or an employee covered by section 5348 of such title—

(A) any increase in the rate of pay payable to such employee which would result from the expiration of limitation contained in section 107(a) of Public Law 97-377 (96 Stat. 1909) shall not take effect, and

(B) any adjustment under subchapter IV of chapter 53 of such title to any wage schedule or rate applicable to such employee which results from a wage survey and which (without regard to paragraph (4) of this subsection) is scheduled to become effective during fiscal year 1984 shall not exceed the schedule or rate payable on September 30, 1983 (determined with regard to the limitation contained in section 107(a) of Public Law 97-377) by more than 3.5 percent.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 9(b) of Public Law 92-392 or section 704(b) of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, the provisions of paragraph (1) shall apply (in such manner as the Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe) to prevailing rate employees to whom such section 9(b) applies, except that the provisions of paragraph (1) shall not apply to any increase in a wage schedule or rate which is required by the terms of a contract entered into before October 1, 1983.

(3) The provisions of paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to wage adjustments for prevailing rate supervisors under the supervisory pay plan published in the Federal Register on May 21, 1982 (47 Fed. Reg. 22100).

(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any adjustment in a wage schedule or rate that—

(A) applies to a prevailing rate employee described in section 5342(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, or that applies to an employee who is covered by section 5348 of such title, or who is subject to paragraph (2) of this subsection;

(B) results from a wage survey; and

(C) would take effect, were it not for this paragraph, on or after October 1, 1983,

shall not take effect until the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning not less than 90 days after the day on which such adjustment would, were it not for this paragraph, otherwise have taken effect. The Office of Personnel Management shall take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

DEDUCTION FROM CIVILIAN PAY FOR COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT OF RETIRED OR RETAINER PAY

SEC. 203. Subsection (d) of section 301 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1982 (96 Stat. 791; 5 U.S.C. 5332 note) is repealed.

LEAVE FOR CERTAIN OVERSEAS EMPLOYEES

SEC. 204. Subsection (a) of section 6 of the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act (73 Stat. 214; 20 U.S.C. 904(a)) is amended by striking out "except that—" and all that follows through the end of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "except that if the school year includes more than eight months, any such teacher who shall have served for the entire school year shall be entitled to ten days of cumulative leave with pay."

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT DEPOSITS COVERING MILITARY SERVICE

SEC. 205. The first sentence of section 306(g) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1982 (5 U.S.C. 8331 note) is amended by striking out "October 1, 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1985".

PAY INCREASES FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES IN PANAMA

SEC. 206. (a) Section 1225(b)(2) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (Public Law 96-70; 93 Stat. 468) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Each time the rates of basic pay under the General schedule are increased under section 5305 of title 5, United States Code, the rate of basic pay for each individual referred to in paragraph (1) shall be increased by the amount which is equal to the overall average percentage by which the rates of pay under the General Schedule are increased under such section at such time."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect with respect to basic pay for service performed on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 207. (a) For the purposes of this section, the term "covered retirement system" shall have the same meaning as provided in section 203(a)(2) of the Federal Employees' Retirement Contribution Temporary Adjustment Act of 1983 (Public Law 98-168; 97 Stat. 1107).

(b)(1) Any individual who performed service of a type referred to in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of section 210(a)(5) of the Social Security Act beginning on or before December 31, 1983, and who did not make an election under section 208(a) of the Federal Employees' Retirement Contribution Temporary Adjustment Act of 1983 (97 Stat. 1111) before the date of enactment of this Act, may make an election under such section 208(a) not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Any such individual who, before the date of enactment of this Act, made an election under section 208(a) of the Federal Employees' Retirement Contribution Temporary Adjustment Act of 1983 may, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, make any other election which such individual was entitled to make under such section 208(a) before January 1, 1984.

(3)(A) Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, any such individual who, before the date of enactment of this Act, made an election under paragraph (1)(B) or (2)(B) of section 208(a) of the Federal Employees' Retirement Contribution Temporary Adjustment Act of 1983 may elect that sections 201 through 207 of such Act apply with respect to the participation of such individual in a covered retirement system.

(B) Sections 201 through 207 of such Act shall apply in accordance with an election made under subparagraph (A).

(4) An election under this subsection shall be made by a written application submitted to the official by whom the electing individual is paid.

(5) An election made as provided in this subsection shall take effect with respect to service performed on or after the first day of the first applicable pay period commencing after the date which is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c)(1) Section 8342(a)(4) of title 5, United States Code, does not apply for the purpose of determining an entitlement to a refund under section 208(c) of the Federal Employees' Retirement Contribution Temporary Adjustment Act of 1983 (97 Stat. 1111).

(2) Paragraph (1) shall take effect with respect to any election made under section 208(a) of such Act or this Act before, on, or after January 1, 1984.

(d) Nothing in this section or the Federal Employees' Retirement Contribution Temporary Adjustment Act of 1983 affects any entitlement to benefits accrued under a covered retirement system before January 1, 1984, except to the extent that any amount refunded under section 208(c) of such Act is not redeposited in the applicable retirement fund.

TITLE III—SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAMS

CHANGES IN LAW TO ACHIEVE COST SAVINGS

SEC. 301. The first sentence of section 18(a) of the Small Business Act is amended by striking "1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "1986".

TITLE IV—VETERANS' BENEFITS AND SERVICES

LIMITATIONS ON LEGISLATION INCREASING RATES OF BENEFITS.

SEC. 401. (a) No legislation that would increase one or more rates of the benefits under chapter 11 or 13 of title 38, United States Code, effective in fiscal year 1984 shall be enacted if such legislation would cause the total costs of legislation increasing such rates in fiscal year 1984 to exceed \$175,500,000 in budget authority or \$145,300,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1984.

(b) In the event that legislation to increase rates of benefits under chapter 11 or 13 of title 38, United States Code, effective in fiscal year 1985 or 1986, is enacted, such legislation shall not take effect before December 1, 1984, or December 1, 1985, respectively.

SECTION 1. Section 201(b)(8) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1781(b)(8)) is amended to read as follows:

"(8) to pay and maintain its deposit and to pay the premium charges for insurance imposed by this title; and"

SEC. 2. Section 202(b) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For each insurance year, each insured credit union which became insured prior to the beginning of that year shall file with

the Board, at such time as the Board prescribes, a certified statement showing the total amount of insured shares in the credit union at the close of the preceding insurance year and both the amount of its deposit or adjustment thereof and the amount of the premium charge for insurance due to the fund for that year, both as computed under subsection (c) of this section. The certified statements required to be filed with the Board pursuant to this subsection shall be in such form and shall set forth such supporting information as the Board shall require. Each such statement shall be certified by the president of the credit union, or by any officer of the credit union designated by its board of directors, that to the best of his knowledge and belief that statement is true, correct, and complete and in accordance with this title and regulations issued thereunder."

Sec. 3. Section 202(c) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking out paragraph (2);
(2) by redesignating paragraph (1) as paragraph (2);

(3) by striking out "Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, each" in paragraph (2), as redesignated, and inserting in lieu thereof "Each";

(4) by striking out "on or before January 31 of each insurance year" in paragraph (2), as redesignated, and inserting in lieu thereof "at such time as the Board prescribes";

(5) by striking out "member accounts" in paragraph (2), as redesignated, and inserting in lieu thereof "insured shares"; and

(6) by inserting before paragraph (2) the following:

"(1) Each insured credit union shall pay to and maintain with the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund a deposit in an amount equaling 1 per centum of the credit union's insured shares. The Board may, in its discretion, authorize insured credit unions to initially fund such deposit over a period of time in excess of one year if necessary to avoid adverse effects on the condition of insured credit unions. The amount of each insured credit union's deposit shall be adjusted annually, in accordance with procedures determined by the Board, to reflect changes in the credit union's insured shares. The deposit shall be returned to an insured credit union in the event that its insurance coverage is terminated, it converts to insurance coverage from another source, or in the event the operations of the fund are transferred from the National Credit Union Administration Board. The deposit shall be returned in accordance with procedures and valuation methods determined by the Board, but in no event shall the deposit be returned any later than one year after the final date on which no shares of the credit union are insured by the Board. The deposit shall not be returned in the event of liquidation on account of bankruptcy or insolvency. The deposit funds may be used by the fund if necessary to meet its expenses, in which case the amount so used shall be expended and shall be replenished by insured credit unions in accordance with procedures established by the Board."

Sec. 4. Section 202(c)(3) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782(c)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) When, at the end of a given insurance year, any loans to the fund from the Federal Government and the interest thereon have been repaid and the equity of the fund exceeds the normal operating level, the Board shall effect for that insurance year a

pro rata distribution to insured credit unions of an amount sufficient to reduce the equity in the fund to its normal operating level."

Sec. 5. Section 202(c)(4) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782(c)(4)) is repealed.

Sec. 6. Subsections (d) through (f) of section 202 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782 (d) through (f)) are amended—

(1) by inserting "its deposit or" before the words "the premium charge" and "any premium charge" each time they appear; and

(2) by striking out "member accounts" and inserting in lieu thereof "insured shares".

Sec. 7. Section 202(g) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "statements, and premium charges" and inserting in lieu thereof "statements, and deposit and premium charges";

(2) by striking out "payment of any premium charge" and inserting in lieu thereof "payment of any deposit or adjustment thereof or any premium charge"; and

(3) by striking out "any premium charge for insurance" and inserting in lieu thereof "any deposit of adjustment thereof or any premium charge for insurance".

Sec. 8. Section 202(h)(1) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782(h)(1)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", unless otherwise prescribed by the Board".

Sec. 9. Section 202(h)(2) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782(h)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) the term 'normal operating level', when applied to the fund, means an amount equal to 1.3 per centum of the aggregate amount of the insured shares in all insured credit unions, or such lower level as the Board may determine; and"

Sec. 10. Section 202(h)(3) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782(h)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) the term 'insured shares' when applied to this section includes share, share draft, share certificate and other similar accounts as determined by the Board, but does not include amounts in excess of the insured account limit set forth in section 207(c)(1)."

Sec. 11. Section 203(3) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782(3)(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "deposits and" before "premium charges"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Board shall report annually to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs of the House of Representatives with respect to the operating level of the fund. Such report shall also include the results of an independent audit of the fund."

Sec. 12. Section 206(d)(1) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1786(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "subsection (a)";

(2) by inserting "maintain its deposit with and" before "pay premiums to the Board"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "Notwithstanding the above, when an insured credit union's insured status is terminated and the credit union subsequently obtains comparable insurance coverage from another source, insurance of its accounts by the fund may cease immediately upon the effective date of such comparable coverage by mutual consent of the credit union and the Board."

Sec. 13. Title III of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1795 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 303 by inserting ", an instrumentality of the United States," after "Central Liquidity Facility" in the second sentence; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"TAX EXEMPTION"

"Sec. 311. (a) The Central Liquidity Facility, its franchise, activities, capital reserves, surplus, and income shall be exempt from all Federal, State, and local taxation now or hereafter imposed, other than taxes on real property held by the Facility (to the same extent, according to its value, as other similar property held by other persons is taxed).

"(b) The notes, bonds, debentures, and other obligations issued on behalf of the Central Liquidity Facility and the income therefrom shall be exempt from all Federal, State, and local taxation now or hereafter imposed: *Provided, That*—

"(1) interest upon such obligations, and gain from the sale or other disposition of such obligations shall not have any Federal income tax or other Federal tax exemptions, as such, and loss from the sale or other disposition of such obligations shall not have any special treatment, as such, under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or laws amendatory or supplementary thereto, except as specifically provided therein; and

"(2) any such obligations shall not be exempt from Federal, State, or local gift, estate, inheritance, legacy succession, or other wealth transfer taxes.

"(c) For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia; and

"(2) taxes imposed by counties or municipalities, or any territory, dependency, or possession of the United States shall be treated as local taxes."

(b) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1979.

ELIMINATION OF PAYROLL DEDUCTION FEES ON FINANCIAL ORGANIZATIONS; ADMINISTRATION OF DISBURSING FUNCTIONS

Sec. 14. (a) Section 3332(b) of title 31, United States Code is amended by inserting "without charge" after "shall be sent".

(b) Section 3332 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsection (c) and redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

Sec. . (a) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, to exceed \$299,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, \$333,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, or \$372,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(b) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for non-defense discretionary activities to exceed \$137,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, \$144,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, or \$151,400,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(c) For the purposes of this section, budget authority shall be determined on the basis applicable for fiscal year 1984.

(d) The provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section may be waived or suspended in the Senate by a majority vote of the Members voting, a quorum being present, or by unanimous consent of the Senate.

(e) It is the sense of Congress that the unprecedented magnitude and persistence of current and projected Federal budget deficits must be addressed in a comprehensive strategy to moderate increases in defense spending while continuing the effective constraints on non-defense discretionary programs. To assure the success of such an initiative, the foregoing procedural restraints, in addition to the total aggregate spending limitations pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, are necessary on budget authority both for defense and for non-defense discretionary programs for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will conduct a hearing on Wednesday, April 25, 1984, at 10 a.m. in room SR 328-A.

The hearing will cover programs administered by the Food and Nutrition Service—food stamps, child nutrition, and commodity distribution.

Anyone wishing further information, please contact the Agriculture Committee staff at 224-0014 or 224-0017.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the public that the Select Committee on Indian Affairs will be holding an oversight hearing on the implementation of the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 on April 25, 1984, beginning at 10:30 a.m., in Senate Dirksen 106.

Those wishing additional information should contact Paul Alexander or Peter Taylor of the committee at 224-2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 24, in order to receive testimony concerning S. 1578, the Local Government Antitrust Act of 1983.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet during the session of

the Senate on April 24, 1984 at 2 p.m. relating to occupational diseases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

DOMESTIC CONTENT LEGISLATION

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, I have scheduled 4 days of hearings on the domestic content bill, S. 707. The hearings will be held May 16 and 24 here in Washington, May 29 in Portland, Oreg., and July 6 in Des Moines, Iowa. Also, the committee is likely to hold another day of hearings in Michigan at a time and place yet to be determined.

Anticipating these hearings, Commerce Secretary Malcolm Baldrige has written to me and every other member of the Senate expressing his concern over the implications of the domestic content bill for the American consumer, our automobile industry and other sectors of the economy.

Mr. President, I ask that the Secretary's letter be printed in the RECORD. The letter follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, April 11, 1984.

HON. BOB PACKWOOD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: I have written you before regarding automobile domestic content legislation. The reasons to oppose this legislation are as strong as ever. Nevertheless, the bills, S. 707 and H.R. 1234, are still before you. I urge you to continue to give this matter serious consideration.

The U.S. auto industry is a real success story of the 1983 economic recovery. Each week brings news of sales, production, profit and employment increases. Domestic manufacturers sold 6.8 million cars in 1983, a 1-million unit or 17 percent improvement over 1982. "Big Three" profits were \$6.27 billion, exceeding the previous industry record of \$5.2 billion in 1977 (and were earned on a volume that was about 26 percent lower than 1977's). Increased productivity and quality, and efforts to meet consumer preferences, triggered this remarkable turnaround. 1984 will be even better. While productivity increased, unemployment in the industry dropped significantly. Peak 1982 employment was 631,000. In 1983, it rose to 755,000, an increase of 124,000 or about 20 percent. Auto workers are back on the job building more and better American cars.

Domestic content violates the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and would invite retaliation from our trading partners. It is anticonsumer and by Commerce Department's estimates would increase auto prices 4.5 percent, or about \$450. Finally, it would be a "job loser" through retaliation and decreased imports.

The U.S. auto industry and the U.S. economy do not need protectionist proposals like S. 707 and H.R. 1234. If you have questions or wish to be briefed on this legislation,

please call the Office of Congressional Affairs on 377-3663.

Sincerely,

MALCOLM BALDRIGE.

RECOGNIZING THE ABILITIES OF DISABLED WORKERS

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I rise to call my colleagues attention to a recent conference held in Stamford, CT, which highlighted the mutually productive relationship that can be developed between disabled persons with job skills and employers with the foresight to recognize the abilities of disabled workers.

On Wednesday, February 15, a seminar, "Successful Accommodation of Disabled Employees—A Perspective for Managers" was sponsored by the Employ the Handicapped Committee of Southwestern Connecticut. The committee's basic purpose is to promote employment of disabled persons. The seminar was planned with this ultimate objective in mind and focused on attitudes and abilities. The committee, comprised of rehabilitation professionals and representatives of the corporate community, worked together for several months to plan, promote, and present this program to corporate management with the intent of increasing awareness and altering attitudes. The committee members are:

Kim Biensahski, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Sharon Campana, General Electric Credit Corporation.

Camille Coppola, Georgia Pacific Corporation.

Marion Dailey, Connecticut Temporaries, Inc.

Tess Damon, Easter Seal Rehabilitation Center.

Beth Fish, Easter Seal Rehabilitation Center.

Dorothy Franko, Norden Systems.

Jerry Gilmartin, GTE.

Patricia Havens, International Playtex.

Wendy Jensen, The Singer Company.

Carol Poirier, Union Trust Company.

Jim Shearin, Easter Seal Rehabilitation Center.

Dorothy Silberman, Easter Seal Rehabilitation Center.

Shari Sisk, Perkin Elmer.

Carol Thomas, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, State of Connecticut.

Lee C. Tsouris, Electrolux Corporation.

Over 75 managers representing 30 corporations attended the seminar and provided an overwhelmingly positive response to the program. The following is a synopsis of the day's activities:

Dr. Henry Viscardi, Chairman—White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals, and Founder of the Human Resources Center on Long Island, gave the keynote address. With sensitivity, he shared his real life experiences with his audience and emphasized the need for business to work harder at successfully integrating disabled workers into the workforce. He spoke of attitudinal barriers faced by disabled persons as being the greatest obstacles to employment.

A 45 minute module on "Employer-Employee Attitudes" was presented using a panel approach. Six disabled professionals from area corporations served as panel members. They were:

Ms. Pat Havens, Benefits Administration, International Playtex.

Ms. Benji Hutter, Secretary, City of Stamford—Health Department.

Mr. Leonard Klanit, General Manager—Fiber Products, Georgia Pacific Corporation.

Mr. Michael Molgano, Computer Programmer Union Carbide Corporation.

Mr. Paul Pateracki, Systems Analyst, American Can Corporation.

Ms. Jill Stine, Graphic Color Plate, Inc.

After brief self-introductions where they shared with the audience the nature of their disability, the panelists entertained questions. The questions and answers were candid and enlightening. The panelists emphasized the need for open communications to break down barriers and dispel fears.

A presentation was made to the managers present about the legal and financial consideration involved in employing disabled employees.

A 45-minute module was presented on "Creative Accommodations." Four professionals from the corporate community shared their success stories in the area of accommodations. They were:

Ms. Camille Coppola, Personnel Administrator, Georgia Pacific Corporation.

Mr. Walter Johnson, Director—Information Services, American Can Company.

Mr. Edward Poole, Assistant Vice President, EEO Compliance—GTE.

Mr. D. L. Webber, Director—EEO Affairs, ITT Corporation.

Through a combination of discussion and visual aids, they illustrated the role creativity plays in making relatively simple and low cost modifications to the work-place which enable the disabled employee to be more successful.

Mr. John Kemp gave the afternoon address. Mr. Kemp, a disabled lawyer and Director of Human Resources for the National Easter Seal Society utilized his outstanding presentation skills combined with humor to captivate and entertain the audience. He spoke of personal experiences to reinforce the needs to address our primary seminar theme of attitudes.

A "Resource Center" was set up in a separate room for all participants to examine. Literature and physical displays were on hand as were representatives from a variety of organizations: Southern New England Telephone Co., Veterans Administration, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Northeast Association of Business, Industry, and Rehabilitation, (NEABIR), Business Information Processing Education for the Disabled (BIPED), and the Easter Seals Rehabilitation Center of Southwestern Connecticut.

The seminar was a tremendous success overall and certainly met its objectives. The individual and corporate support in planning and participating in the program is indicative of the willingness of Fairfield County corporations to work together to be leaders in the area of employing and fully utilizing disabled workers. It should serve as a model for business across the Nation to learn the abilities of the disabled worker.●

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

● Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is required by paragraph 4 of rule 35 that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this notice of a Senate employee who proposes to participate in a program, the principal objective of which is educational, sponsored by a foreign government or a foreign educational or charitable organization involving travel to a foreign country paid for by that foreign government or organization.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Mr. Richard Rolf of the staff of Senator HATFIELD to participate in a program sponsored by Hauss Rissen, in Hamburg and Berlin, West Germany, from April 5-13, 1984.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Rolf in the seminar in Hamburg and Berlin, West Germany, at the expense of Hauss Rissen, to discuss United States-German relations, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit R. Ian Butterfield, a member of Senator ROTH's staff, to participate in a program in Taiwan, sponsored by the Chinese Culture University from April 15-24, 1984.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Butterfield in the program in Taiwan, at the expense of the Chinese Culture University, to discuss United States-Taiwan relations, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Senator DENNIS DECONCINI, his wife Susan, and Jane Green and Stephen Wilson of his Senate staff, to participate in a program sponsored by Soochow University, in Taipei, Taiwan from April 13-18, 1984.

The committee has determined that participation by Senator DECONCINI, his wife Susan and Jane Green and Stephen Wilson of the Senator's staff, in the program in Taipei, Taiwan at the expense of Soochow University, to discuss United States-Taiwan relations, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Senator ARLEN SPECTER and Mrs. Specter, and Mr. Paul R. Michel, a member of the Senator's staff, to participate in the following programs from January 3-16, 1984: Visits to the Republic of China, sponsored by Soochow University, to Hong Kong, sponsored by the Chinese University of New Asia College and to the Peoples Republic of China, sponsored

by the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs.

The committee has determined that participation by Senator and Mrs. Specter and Mr. Michel in these programs, for meetings and discussions with Government and civilian leaders, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Senator PAUL S. TRIBLE, JR., to participate in a program sponsored by Tamkang University, in Taipei, Taiwan, from October 7-13, 1983.

The committee has determined that participation by Senator TRIBLE in the program in Taipei, at the expense of Tamkang University, to meet with Government and civilian leaders is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Mr. Paul Sivley of the staff of Senator FRANK MURKOWSKI, to participate in a program in Jordan, sponsored by the World Affairs Council, from April 13-22, 1984.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Sivley in the program in Jordan, at the expense of the World Affairs Council, a private educational and cultural association based in Amman, Jordan, to participate in a fact-finding trip, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.●

HONORING WESTAR I'S 10TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I want my colleagues in this body to know that 10 years ago, on April 13, 1974, Western Union launched America's first domestic communications satellite—Westar I. That launch marked the beginning of the Nation's first system for commercial communications by satellite.

This historic event is recognized for three reasons important to America's goals in space:

First, the entrepreneurial risk and pioneering investment of Western Union and its commitment to Westar I marked a significant first step in the commercial utilization of space by private industry.

Second, the perfect performance of Westar I gave credence and confidence to a fledgling commercial satellite industry in the United States which today represents a capital investment of more than \$3 billion.

And last, Mr. President, through its preparation, launch, and development, Westar I demonstrated to the world the successful collaboration of American industry and Government working together in an extraordinary partnership to extend the frontiers of space communications.

In his state of the Union message earlier this year, President Reagan set forth his goal to build on America's pioneer spirit in the next important frontier, space, with the development of a permanently manned space station within a decade. In promoting private sector investment in space, the President observed that our country's space progress to date is a "tribute to American teamwork and excellence."

Over 120 years ago, Western Union linked the Pacific Coast with the rest of the Nation through the first transcontinental telegraph system. That same pioneering spirit fired America's first communications satellite, Westar I, whose 10th anniversary we honor.●

EUROPEAN CONCERN OVER CENTRAL AMERICAN POLICY

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, recent French and British Government criticism of the mining of Nicaraguan harbors is a timely reminder of longstanding European concern over the Reagan administration's policy toward Central America. We should heed these expressions from our closest allies.

Over 600 European parliamentarians recently outlined European concerns in a letter to Speaker O'NEILL. In that letter, the parliamentarians note that the "bridges, factories, cooperatives, geothermal, and harbor facilities built with the aid of Western European development agencies have been seriously damaged by saboteurs, directed and paid by the CIA." They urge an end to the covert war and support for a negotiated solution.

I ask that the full text of this letter and signatures be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

To: Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. O'NEILL: Last July a large group of Western European parliamentarians and politicians wrote to you to express grave concern about the U.S. Administration's acts of economic, political and military hostility toward Nicaragua. We urged you to acknowledge the right of Nicaragua to decide on its own future and to end military and political confrontation in the region.

Since we last wrote you the House of Representatives has voted twice against funding the CIA's covert war against Nicaragua, votes which we heartily endorse. But the U.S. Administration's aggression toward Nicaragua has escalated: offers to negotiate by the Nicaraguan government have been spurned, efforts to isolate Nicaragua economically and politically have intensified and military attacks on Nicaragua have increased.

In light of recent events in the Caribbean our concern for the preservation of the very fabric of international law has grown. We believe that the attempt to place events throughout the Third World and especially in Central America in an East-West context is fraught with danger and is not warranted by the facts. To follow this mistaken road, we fear, might well lead the U.S. into a protracted regional war in Central America.

We wish to reiterate that we think that the Nicaraguan government clearly enjoys broad support among the people of Nicaragua, based on its achievements of land reform, health, education and basic human rights. We believe that the scheduled 1985 elections in Nicaragua will offer the Nicaraguan people a fair opportunity to determine their own future. The very concerns expressed by Congress and the Administration for democracy in Nicaragua are vitiated by the Administration's covert war and economic policies.

The U.S. Administration's support for a war against Nicaragua threatens not only the lives of the Nicaraguan people and the future of the country itself, but also undermines our attempts to aid Nicaragua through development assistance. The bridges, factories, cooperatives, geothermal and harbour facilities built with the aid of Western European development agencies have been seriously damaged by saboteurs, directed and paid by the CIA.

We therefore appeal strongly to you:

To support negotiated solutions to Central American problems, such as those proposed by the Contadora group and the Nicaraguan government, which has shown renewed flexibility and willingness to negotiate

To continue your efforts:

(a) To oppose the granting of new funds for CIA actions against Nicaragua;

(b) To withdraw support for the forces attacking Nicaragua from its border areas;

(c) To cease using other countries in the region for the concentration of troops which constitute a latent and manifest threat to Nicaragua

To assure that Nicaragua receives non-discriminatory treatment by the U.S. within international financial institutions such as the World Bank

To act to assure that Nicaragua is treated according to the same criteria as other developing nations in the fields of aid and trade.

SIGNATORIES

The Netherlands

Social Democratic Party (P.v.d.A.):

E. L. Herfkens	A. Kosto
J. M. den Uyl	F. Moor
M. van den Berg	I. Muller-van Ast
R. ter Beek	F. Niessen
J. van Kemenade	J. van Nieuwenhoven
M. P. A. van Dam	D. van Oloyen
W. Meyer	S. Poppe
H. Kombrink	W. A. de Pree
E. van Thijn	H. Rienks
H. Alders	N. Salomons
H. van den Bergh	B. Spieker
R. de Boois	P. Stoffelen
F. Buurmeyer	R. Tazelaar
F. Casticum	R. Toussaint
I. Dales	M. van Traa
J. C. Th. van der Doef	E. ter Veld
I. Haas-Berger	P. de Visser
R. P. Hummel	P. de Waart
W. Jabaay	J. Wallage
H. Knol	T. Woltgens
J. Konings	K. Zijlstra
	K. de Vries

Independent Christian Democrats:

J. N. Scholten
P. Dijkman

France

Socialist Party (P.S.):

P. Joxe	G. Vadepier
C. Estier	V. Neiertz
A. Bellon	G. Bapt
J. Natiez	R. Douyere

G. Labazee
C. Laurissegues
P. Marchand
F. Mortelette

J. P. Santa Cruz
J. Huntzinger
G. Domenach-Chich
N. Bourdillat

Germany

Social Democratic Party (S.P.D.):

W. Roth	H. Menzel
U. Holtz	A. Müller-Emmert
E. Eppler	M. Müller
O. Lafontaine	F. Müntefering
G. Bamberg	P. Paterna
H. G. Bernrath	G. Paull
R. Binding	H. Peter
L. Blanck	R. Purps
A. von Bülow	H. Rapp
W. M. Catenhusen	R. Schmidt
H. Collet	R. Schmitt
L. Curdt	R. Schöfberger
K. Delorme	G. Schröder
F. Duve	O. Schreiner
L. Fischer	W. Schwenk
K. Fuchs	H. Sielaff
F. Gerstl	H. Simonis
K. Gilges	D. Spöri
E. Haar	H. A. Stelner
G. Heyenn	L. Stiegler
R. Hiller	M. Terborg
H. Hoffmann	H. G. Toetmeyer
K. Immer	J. Vahlberg
G. Jansen	E. Waltemathe
V. Jung	E. Walter
K. Kirschner	G. Wartenberg
H. Klein	G. Weisskirchen
H. U. Klose	E. von der Wiesche
K. Kubler	R. Zutt
E. Kuhlwein	R. Hartung
U. Lambinus	H. Scherf
K. Lohmann	P. von Oertzen
I. Matthäus-Meier	

Great Britain

Labour Party:

E. Heffer	D. Hoyle
D. Anderson	J. Maynard
E. Deakins	J. Richardson
J. Evans	D. Canavan
G. Foulkes	J. Corbyn
J. Hart	

Liberal Party:

D. Steele
Independent:
Lord Chitnis

Ireland

Fianna Fail Party:

D. Spring	M. Moynihan
B. Desmond	J. Bermingham
R. Quinn	M. D. Higgins
F. Cluskey	F. Mahony
J. Ryan	M. Robinson
S. Treacy	H. McAuliffe Ennis
E. Desmond	M. Ferris
M. Taylor	B. Howlin
T. O'Sullivan	S. McGonagle
S. Pattison	P. Magner
F. Prendergast	T. Conway
F. McLaughlin	J. Harte

Italy

Communist Party (P.C.I.):

E. Berlinguer	F. Palopoli
G. Napolitano	G. Vignoli
A. Rubbi	S. Sanfilippo
C. Petruccioli	G. V. Ronzani
I. Trebbi	R. Minozzi
G. Giadresco	R. Palmmini
E. Quercioli	A. Brina
L. Canullo	F. Auletta
B. Sanlorenzo	M. Graduat
R. Zangheri	E. Polidori
U. Spagnoli	A. Riccardi
E. Cerquetti	G. Crippa

G. Gatti
P. Lops
M. Toma
B. Gelli
S. Cherchi
B. Sannella
G. Binelli
B. Virgili
R. Donazzon
A. Provantini
S. Picchetti
E. Belardi
V. Angelini
G. Alborghetti
L. Benevelli
N. M. Fornari
L. Cominato
P. Proietti
L. Sandirocco
A. Iovannitti
G. Bellini
A. Malgari
A. Scaramucci
C. Fittante
A. Mainardi
F. Zoppetti
A. Giovagnoli
A. Ceci
A. Francese
C. Bernabucci
L. Badesi
L. Grassucci
M. T. Granati
L. Bulleri
R. Moschini
G. Janni
A. Montessoro
P. Ciofi
F. Calvanese
G. Borghini
A. M. Boselli
S. Rindone
F. Trabacchi
N. Umidi
G. U. Polesello
F. Sapino
V. L. Cordiali
N. Pallanti
A. Satanassi

Socialist Party (P.S.I.):

S. Labriola
F. Piantrotti
F. Piro
G. La Ganga

Radical Party (P.R.):

G. Melega

Independent Part (G.I.):

S. Rodota
N. Ginzburg
G. Codrignani
E. Giovannini
G. Nebbia
F. Bassanini
G. Ferrara
E. Masina
R. La Valle
F. Russo
G. Fiori
L. Pingitore

Sweden

Social Democratic Party:

B. Silfverstrand
A. Gustavsson
S. Ericson
A. Andersson
G. Engman
H. G. Franck
M. Andersson
B. Evermo
S. Palm
A. Lindh
M. L. Loow

S. Zavettieri
M. Ferrari
G. Albertibi

F. Ongaro
F. Pintus
A. Ossicini
M. Gossini
E. Milani
C. Napoleoni
M. Riva
B. Ulianich
E. E. Agnoletti
A. Alberti
L. Angelini
G. Pasquino

T. Karlsson
B. Lofstedt
B. Rosqvist
L. Mattson
D. Haavik
J. Bergqvist
E. Svensson
K. E. Svartberg
M. Wallstrom
G. Andersson
S. Haeggroth

Denmark
Social Democratic Party:
A. Joergensen
L. Budtz
S. Aukun

Finland
Social Democratic Party:
O. Helminen
K. Suonio
M. Adhe
L. Jaakonsaari
A. Alho
P. Starast
T. Paavilainen
M. Nyby
A. Kalliomäki
P. Ala-Kapee
L. Savolainen
R. Lindroos
T. Roos
S. Hurskainen
T. Haemäläinen
K. Raatikainen
S. Tikka
E. Liikanen
R. Paasilinna
K. Toernqvist

Belgium

Socialist Party (S.P.):

L. Tobback
L. van Velthoven
E. Baldewijns
N. de Batselier
V. van der Heyden
G. Temmerman
J. van Elewijck
M. Galle
L. Hancke
A. Bogaerts
O. Lefebvre
J. Sleekx
J. Leclercq
M. Bourry
H. de Loor
W. Claes

I. Noergaard
J. Andersen

S. M. Paakkinen
M. Roennholm
R. Ahonen
P. Eenilä
P. Lahti-Nuuttila
A. L. Piipari
J. Ranta
T. Halonen
S. Knuuttila
A. Ajo
M. Aaltonen
K. Baerlund
A. von Bell
K. Urpilainen
J. Rantanen
P. Hietala
J. Tuovinen
M. Laehdesmäki
M. L. Tykkyläinen
P. Paasio

Switzerland

Social Democratic Party (P.S.S.):

D. Robbani
Y. Jaggi
J. P. Metral
R. Mueller
J. N. Rey
E. Salmina
A. Ratti
L. Uchtenhagen
T. Maissen

F. Schlegel
P. Vollmer
R. H. Strahm
C. Berger
H. K. Schiesser
E. Ecoffey
A. Lutz
R. Glas
M. Kaufmann

*Austria*Social Democratic Party (S.P.O.E.) and
Liberal Party (F.P.O.E.):

S. Wille
F. Peter
F. Marsch
J. Steinhuber
F. Precht
F. Hochmair
R. Parnigoni
J. Hoell
H. Hobl
A. Kraeutl
E. Nedwed
R. Gradischnik
K. Muehlbacher
H. Kapaun
H. Kuba
A. Brennstetter
H. Seel
G. Tycht
J. Cap
H. Hawlicek

G. Traxler
P. Jankowitsch
E. E. Veselsky
W. Brunner
H. Woerndl
P. Keppel-Mueller
H. Weinberger
J. Lenzi
J. Gradenegger
H. Braun
E. Schranz
R. Tonn
H. Gaertner
H. Tieber
K. Preiss
B. Ederer
H. Leithenmayer
M. Strache
J. Pfeifer
A. Czettel

M. Hesele
I. Smejkal
E. Dobesberger
F. Ruhaltinger
A. Teschl
A. Reichl
A. Gossi
A. Konecny
J. Stippel
A. Grabner
A. Rechberger
A. Praher
K. Neuwirth
W. Guggenberger
F. Samwald
H. Grabner

E. Zipser
R. R. Gmoser
A. Roppert
A. Schober
R. Elmecker
E. Nowotny
H. J. Ressel
A. Fister
J. Peck
G. Dietrich
J. Offenbeck
R. Poeder
H. Kabas
M. P. Partik-Pable
F. Probst
W. Grabner-Meyer

Greece

Socialist Party (PASOK):

A. Kazazis
A. G. Papadopoulos
S. Katiniotis
A. Damianidis
A. Darbianakis
S. Marinidis
N. Papaioanou
A. Natzipetrou
G. Dabidopoulos
O. Papastratis
M. Papastefanakis
G. Malliakas
D. Papadimitriou
G. Klavdianos
P. Balbis
G. Konstantinidis
N. Houlis
K. Tsigaridas
G. Koutsogiannis
B. Agorastis
H. Fotiou
G. Hotakis
M. Tsaparas
K. Papageorgious
K. Mpakogiannis
K. Kontopodis
E. Drretakis

A. Kolioussis
G. Varkaris
G. Kapouralos
G. Terzopoulos
K. Amanatidis
A. Ntentidakis
H. Georgakakis
K. Kanavakis
H. Mpasagiannis
G. Papadonikolakis
A. Mantelis
G. Glavinas
G. Degiannis
P. Fountas
S. Anastasakos
S. Anthopoulos
M. Vathis
T. Karras
E. Pentaris
S. Akrita
K. Zervos
A. Petralias
S. Kaloudis
P. Salamalikis
T. Intzes
P. Stefanidis
A. Golfopoulos

Communist Party:

K. Loules
D. Mavrodoglou
K. Vasalos
E. Ipsilanti
D. Sahinis

K. Kappos
N. Kaloudis
M. Damanaki
G. Farakos
A. Ampatielos

Euro-Parliament

Different Parties:

I. van den Heuvel
K. van Miert
J. van Minnen
R. Cohen
A. Krouwel-Vlam
M. van Hemeldonck
G. Fuchs
B. Halligan
G. J. Adam
D. Rogalla
D. Enright
C. Markopoulos

W. Focke
W. J. Griffiths
A. R. Rogers
E. Gredal
H. Wiczorek-Zeul
W. Verminnen
R. Linkohr
G. Schmid
B. Weber
O. Schwenneke
G. Walter
H. Seefeld

ADVANCE NOTIFICATION—
PROPOSED ARMS SALES

● Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive advance notification of proposed arms sales under that act in excess of \$50 million or, in the case of major defense equipment as defined in the act, those in excess of \$14 million. Upon receipt of such notification, the Congress had 30 calendar days during which the sale

may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Pursuant to an informal understanding, the Department of Defense has agreed to provide the committee with a preliminary notification 20 days before transmittal of the official notification. The official notification will be printed in the *RECORD* in accordance with previous practice.

I wish to inform Members of the Senate that such a notification has been received.

Interested Senators may inquire as to the details of this advance notification at the office of the Committee on Foreign Relations, room SD-423.

The notification follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AGENCY,
Washington, DC, April 11, 1984.
HON. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 84-36 and under separate cover the classified annex thereto. This Transmittal concerns the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter of Offer to Greece for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$40 million. Shortly after this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to notify the news media of the unclassified portion of this Transmittal.

You will also find attached a certification as required by Section 620C(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, that this action is consistent with Section 620C(b) of that statute.

Sincerely,

GLENN A. RUDD,
Acting Director.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 84-36

Notice of proposed issuance of letter of offer pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act

- (i) Prospective purchaser: Greece.
- (ii) Total estimated value: Major defense equipment (as defined in section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act), \$19 million; other, \$21 million; total, \$40 million.
- (iii) Description of articles or services offered: A quantity of two PHALANX Close-In Weapon Systems with spare parts, support equipment, contractor engineering and technical support, technical documentation, and training.
- (iv) Military department: Navy (LDS).
- (v) Sales commission, fee, etc., paid, offered, or agreed to be paid: None.
- (vi) Sensitivity of technology contained in the defense articles or defense services proposed to be sold: See Annex under separate cover.
- (vii) Section 28 report: Case not included in section 28 report.
- (viii) Date report delivered to Congress: April 11, 1984.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Greece—Phalanx Close-In Weapon System and Support

The Government of Greece has requested the purchase of a quantity of two Phalanx Close-In Weapons Systems (CIWS) with spare parts, support equipment, contractor

engineering and technical support, technical documentation, and training at an estimated cost of \$40 million.

This sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by improving the military capabilities of Greece in fulfillment of its NATO obligations; furthering NATO rationalization, standardization, and interoperability; and enhancing the defenses of the Western Alliance.

The Greek Navy plans to put the Phalanx CIWS aboard their two Kortenaer class frigates in order to provide them with a modernized defensive capability. The Greek Navy will be able to absorb these systems with little effort and these systems will be provided in accordance with, and subject to the limitations on use and transfer provided for under the Arms Export Control Act, as embodied in the terms of sale. This sale will not adversely affect either the military balance in the region or U.S. efforts to encourage a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question.

The prime contractor will be the Pomona Division of General Dynamics of Pomona, Calif.

Implementation of this sale will require the assignment of three additional U.S. Government personnel to Greece for four weeks and five additional contractor representatives to Greece for up to two months.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this sale.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR SECURITY ASSISTANCE, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, DC, April 3, 1984.

Pursuant to section 620C(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (the Act), and the authority vested in me by Department of State Delegation of Authority No. 145, I hereby certify that the provision to Greece of two PHALANX Close-In Weapons Systems at an estimated cost of \$40 million is consistent with principles contained in section 620C(b) of the Act.

This certification will be made part of the certification to the Congress under section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act regarding the proposed sale of the above-named articles and is based on the justification accompanying said certification, and of which such justification constitutes a full explanation.

WILLIAM SCHNEIDER, Jr. ●

TENNESSEE RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WEEK

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I wish to honor the contributions made to our National Government by military, postal, and civilian service retirees. In their Federal careers, these outstanding individuals did a truly outstanding job of administering the laws that we, the Congress, enacted. They provided continuity and stability to our country in periods of turmoil. And they gave a diverse succession of Presidents the expertise needed to implement their policies.

Every community in the country relies on the letter carriers, agricultural agents, civil engineers and others who enter public service. In Tennessee, we are proud of the accomplishments of these workers. Their respon-

siveness of our needs and their fine contributions to our governmental system deserve our sincere appreciation and greatest admiration.

Unfortunately, for the past several years, retirees from the Federal service have figured heavily in the Reagan administration's cost control plans. They have experienced large reductions in health and cost-of-living benefits, and basic changes in the retirement system have created confusion, doubt, and deep anxiety among Federal retirees.

I have been in the forefront of the opposition to these efforts to undermine the integrity of the civil service retirement system. We have promised reasonable benefits to those who are currently retirees, as well as those who are now contributing toward a future retirement. And we should honor our commitment.

In Tennessee, there are 18,958 retired employees with average annuities of \$1,062 a month. There are 7,184 persons receiving survivor annuities on the average of \$486 a month. These individuals have earned these benefits after long years of Federal service. And their retirement income is fully taxable.

Civil servants are, on the whole, selfless dedicated individuals who are a source of pride for those of us who value the merit system under which they work. The standards for their selection are very high. A stable Federal retirement system is important to attracting and retaining talented and productive employees to Government careers. I pledge to continue to work on behalf of the Federal retiree in Congress to preserve the integrity of their benefits.

I congratulate Tennessee's retired Federal workers on their service to the U.S. Government. The week of April 22-28 has been designated "Retired Federal Employees Week" in Tennessee. With unanimous consent, I ask that the gubernatorial proclamation announcing this week be printed in the *RECORD*.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the U.S. Civil Service Act of 1883 was signed into law by then President Chester A. Arthur, thereby creating the U.S. Civil Service System; and

Whereas, the U.S. Civil Service Retirement System was created in 1920 and signed into law by then President Woodrow Wilson; and

Whereas, virtually all state, county and municipal civil service systems have derived from the U.S. Civil Service Act; and

Whereas, untold thousands of U.S. Civil Service employees have worked diligently, patriotically, silently and with little notice to uphold the highest traditions and ideals of our country; and

Whereas, thousands of Federal employees are retired in Tennessee and continue to devote inestimable time and effort toward the betterment of our communities and state;

Now, therefore, I, Lamar Alexander, as Governor of the State of Tennessee, do hereby proclaim the week of April 22-28, 1984, as retired Federal Employees Week in Tennessee and do urge all our citizens to join me in this observance.●

ADULT EDUCATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

● Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. President, recently I introduced with my colleagues, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. HATCH, and Mrs. HAWKINS, a bill to reauthorize the Adult Education Act through fiscal year 1989. This bill, S. 2496, continues the Federal commitment to eradicating illiteracy in our Nation. While the adult education programs are estimated to serve approximately 2 million people a year, almost 23 million Americans fall into the category of functionally illiterate. This is a tragic waste of human potential, both economically and socially.

The adult education programs funded by the Federal Government and by States do make a difference. However, with the number of Americans in need of remedial services, volunteers and the private sector must become involved. Already many businesses donate money, as well as their employees to voluntary efforts to help tutor illiterate adults.

Recently, Business Week ran an article on the number of businesses becoming involved in the fight against functional illiteracy. I ask permission to have this article, entitled "How Business is Joining the Fight Against Functional Illiteracy" reprinted in the RECORD. I also urge my colleagues to support S. 2496 to continue the Federal Government's commitment to reducing illiteracy in our country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW BUSINESS IS JOINING THE FIGHT AGAINST FUNCTIONAL ILLITERACY

Item: CBS News correspondent Fred Graham seemed to be stammering on a live morning broadcast earlier this year. The reason: The technician turning the teleprompter was unable to keep up with Graham because, it turned out, the technician could not read.

Item: Polaroid Corp.'s Al Robinson did so well as an engineer's aide that the company made him a supervisor, but he sat mum through staff meetings about equipment problems, phoning his boss at home to offer suggestions. The reason: His grammar was so bad that he was ashamed to speak up in a group.

Item: An insurance company authorized a payment of \$22.00 on a dental claim, but the patient received a check for \$2,200. The reason: The clerk who made out the payment did not understand the meaning of the decimal point.

Incidents like these, producing costs that range from annoyance to major financial losses, are worrying American management about their employees' level of knowledge—and what it means for the economy, today and tomorrow. In response, growing numbers of companies are pouring money and

manpower into remedial education. "The issue of functional illiteracy lies coiled at the center of our unemployment problems," says Robert W. Feagles, senior vice-president of Travelers Insurance Co., "and it threatens this country's ultimate ability to succeed in the world market."

MINIMUM NEEDS

The problem is not simple illiteracy. Virtually every adult in the U.S. can write a signature and recognize the word on a stop sign. But one needs a higher level of reading ability—and associated math and problem-solving skills—to function in today's society. At the least, a worker should be able to read such instructions as: "In an emergency, pull lever." Experts describe this as the equivalent of a sixth-grade education. The Education Dept. estimates that some 25 million American adults—one in seven—are not at this level, whatever their formal education. They are functionally illiterate.

Moreover, the problem is growing. The agency estimates that 2.3 million people a year are added to the ranks of the functionally illiterate: 1 million teenagers who leave school without elementary skills and 1.3 million non-English-speaking arrivals. They equal almost exactly the number trying to climb out of these ranks—the 2.3 million students who enroll annually in adult literacy programs. Since no program is 100% successful, the functionally illiterate population rises inexorably year by year.

Basic social forces help to perpetuate the problem. "Many people are part of a culture where reading things is not the primary way of getting information," says Linda E. Stoker, training manager at Polaroid. These people produce children who do not read because reading is irrelevant to their out-of-school lives. The problem is especially severe among minorities. Some 56% of Hispanic 17-year-olds and some 47% of black 17-year-olds are rated as functionally illiterate. The latter figure has prompted a group of predominantly black organizations to form the Assault on Illiteracy Program to foster literacy among black adults.

Other figures reveal the economic and social impact of illiteracy. At least half of the unemployed are functionally illiterate, according to Labor Dept. estimates. Half of the prison population is illiterate, according to Diane W. Vines, director of the Education Dept.'s National Adult Literacy Initiative. "The cost to society . . . is staggering," says Per B. Christiansen, a marketing manager at Nalco Chemical Co. and head of its literacy project.

KISSING FROGS

Nalco and other companies combating illiteracy deplore its social effects, but their primary motive is its corporate cost. Vines cites, an example: "A New York-based insurance company estimates that 70% of dictated correspondence must be redone at least once because of human errors." Estimates of the productivity losses attributable to undereducation put the figure in the hundreds of millions of dollars. When the center for Public Resources in New York City conducted a study of such losses in 1982, the single company willing to report the cost of wasted material and botched work set the figure at \$250,000 a year—and the company was a medium-size manufacturer.

But workers without the skills to do their current jobs are only part of the problem. Increasingly, business is finding that even competent entry-level employees lack the skills needed to move up. Identifying the promotable among hundreds of job appli-

cants has become a tough and expensive business. Says Donald C. Mann, a vice-president of Prudential Insurance Co.: "As one young woman told me after a day of interviewing local high school graduates, 'Before you find Prince Charming, you have to kiss a lot of frogs.'"

Even superb and extensive interviewing will not do the job in the years ahead. "We're faced with a demographic trend," says Jack W. Troster, corporate staffing manager of Texas Instruments Inc. Since birth rates were relatively low during the late 1960s and early 1970s, the number of Americans reaching working age is falling steadily. Only 3.2 million will turn 18 in 1992, 40% fewer than in the peak year of 1979.

At the same time that these fewer new workers are making selectivity harder, corporate job needs will become more complex. "Technology is changing," says Edward E. Sutton, assistant vice-president for human resources development at New York Telephone Co. "Basic jobs are being eliminated and new jobs are coming in, requiring a higher level of skills." This is true not only of jobs involving computers and other advance equipment but also of so-called unskilled jobs. "What kind of literacy will a truck driver need in 30 years?" asks Harold L. Hodgkinson, senior fellow at the Institute for Educational Leadership in Washington. His answer: "Truck drivers are going to operate some sophisticated machinery." They need fairly high reading and math skills right now, he adds.

REDESIGNING JOBS

Not only does business have fewer jobs requiring only minimal literacy, but the literate worker who traditionally filled some relatively low-level jobs have gone elsewhere. For stores seeking sales help, for instance, "it's a decidedly different labor market today than it was 15 or 20 years ago," says Alice Bird McCord, personnel vice-president of the National Retail Merchants Assn. in New York City. The kind of well-educated housewife who formerly took a part-time minimum-wage job in a department store then is probably a full-time careerist now, leaving the lower-level job to the less well-equipped.

In response, some stores have redesigned their jobs. "What has happened . . . is that lower-level jobs have been deskilled," McCord says. For example, fast-food outlets use cash registers on which the checker need only touch a few keys to figure automatically the price of an item and the change to be returned. On a more complex level, department stores are altering their whole sales approach. Because they cannot count on salespeople to suggest appropriate accessories, they are putting more of their budgets into fashion-oriented newspaper supplements that display accessories with the advertised dress or coat.

But these are only stopgap measures in an increasingly technology-dependent economy. More and more, companies are tackling the functional illiteracy problem head-on:

Aiding current programs

Nalco's decision to use part of Christiansen's time—and company resources—for fund-raising to create new chapters of the Literacy Volunteers of America is typical. The company's own foundation will be putting money into the project later this year. Aetna Life & Casualty Co. and the Gannett Foundation Co. also donate regularly to literacy programs. Gulf & Western, J.C.

Penney, and Citibank furnish space for tutoring sessions.

A leader in the field, Dayton Hudson Corp.'s B. Dalton Bookseller, has earmarked \$3 million over four years for its literacy program. The company encourages executives and other employees to participate in local programs, both as board members and as tutors. It has also promised to recruit other companies for the campaign with the goal of producing 50,000 volunteer tutors by 1986, a 150% increase over the current number.

Dalton helped found the Coalition for Literacy, a government-private sector alliance that has arranged for Benton & Bowles Inc., the New York advertising agency, to draw up a public service media campaign through the Advertising Council. The campaign has a dual aim: to recruit volunteer tutors and to tell people without basic skills about the free teaching programs available in their communities.

The Business Council for Effective Literacy, founded early this year with \$1 million from Harold W. McGraw, Jr., chairman of McGraw-Hill Inc., which publishes Business Week, will pay about \$300,000 of B&B's out-of-pocket costs in developing the campaign. It is also helping to fund the clearinghouse operation that will handle the calls generated by the ads, referring volunteers and potential students to the best programs. A television program on the illiteracy problem, starring country singer Johnny Cash, generated some 6,000 calls when it was broadcast on 170 commercial television stations in January.

Training employees

These projects range from programs that use workers to tutor other employees on a one-to-one basis at Aetna and United Technologies Corp. to a large-scale training program at New York Telephone, which seeks to boost the education of barely literate employees to 9th or 10th grade levels.

Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) hired a former school teacher to give classes in grammar and spelling to newly hired secretaries. Nabisco Brands Inc. offers employees at a Suffolk (Va.) Planters Peanuts factory four hours of elementary school courses a week on company time, with additional classes available on their own time. Polaroid, one of the pioneers in corporate-sponsored basic education, now targets from 500 to 750 employees, a year for such remedial programs, which include teaching English to immigrants. In math, Polaroid teachers find that problem employees can usually handle whole numbers but have trouble with fractions.

Gillette Co. last year paid a public school teacher to give a after-hours instruction to 30 employees at its hair-care products plant in St. Paul, Minn. More than half received high school equivalency certificates. The company, which figures that 100 more of its 600 production workers need the course, will renew the program this fall.

Working with public schools

Companies have long been reluctant to lean on school administrators for fear of seeming to criticize the towns where the companies are located. But now they find that the communities want their input.

Dalton gives grants to local school districts to hire speakers who will persuade teachers to put more emphasis on teaching reading skills. A. O. Smith Corp. and Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co. have "adopted" Milwaukee's Washington High School. They provide tutors, classroom

speakers, and advice on the skills necessary for the job market. Similar programs are springing up in other cities: 30 companies in the Nashville area have adopted schools.

At Texas Instruments, Vice-President Bernard H. List says, "TI's got to do something we've never done before: get involved with the primary and secondary education system." Visiting Dallas schools, he found that "kids were being counseled not to take 'the hard courses.' I was mind-boggled." As a result, TI employees now go into the classroom to talk about why tough math courses are stepping stones to achievement later in life. In addition, 10 company employees began working one day a week with fourth and fifth grade math students in Dallas, helping them discover the excitement of the subject instead of learning by rote. This fall, TI will extend the program to its other plant cities.

So far, the corporate concern with functional illiteracy has focused on the way it affects the employment pool. Eventually, however, a population with deficient reading skills will have to be treated differently as customers, too. In the product-liability area, for instance, "litigation goes on all the time on the adequacy of warnings, and part of the question is adequacy to the literacy level of the user," notes Linda Atkinson, a Detroit lawyer who represents plaintiffs in such suits. And Gloria A. Lanza, vice-president of the American Association of Advertising Agencies in New York City, expresses an even more basic marketing worry: "If we don't have people out there who can read, how can they read our ads?"

TRIBUTE TO KATHRYN MICHALOS

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I am deeply honored, once again, to take part in Baltimore's annual commemoration of the Holocaust, and to pay tribute to the martyrdom of the 6 million Jewish victims of Nazism. It is a time to reflect upon the lessons which their indescribable suffering—and courage—teaches us. Today, as we look back upon the inhumanity of the Nazi regime, an inhumanity virtually beyond human comprehension, we honor a woman, and the memory of her husband, who risked their lives to defy that inhumanity. I am speaking of Mrs. Kathryn Michalos and her husband, the late Elias Michalos, who sheltered Emmanuel and Emily Velelli from the brutal occupation of Greece more than 40 years ago. In honoring the Michaloses, we also pay deserved tribute to those "righteous gentiles" who, throughout Europe, risked their own lives in order to give life to others.

Justice Brandeis once remarked that:

Of all the peoples in the world, those of two tiny States stand preeminent as contributors to our present civilization: the Greeks and the Jews.

Winston Churchill noted that:

No two other races have set such a mark upon the world. Both the Jews and the Greeks have shown an amazing capacity for survival, in spite of unending perils and sufferings from external oppressors.

In the case of the Velelli family, survival depended upon the shelter and protection that the Michalos family unselfishly provided.

During the German occupation of southern Greece in 1943, Kathryn and Elias Michalos risked imprisonment and death to save the lives of the Velellis, Jews fleeing from Nazi persecution. For many months, the Michalos family provided food, shelter, and friendship. After the Nazis had marched through the village of Patras the first time, the Michaloses home was destroyed and they moved in with the Velelli family for a number of months, constantly worried that they would be discovered. After the village was razed a second time, the families moved from Patras to seek shelter elsewhere.

This friendship did not end with the war, however. As coincidence would have it, both families settled near Baltimore, finding each other through a cousin of the Velelli family. Over the years, they have remained close and dedicated friends, sharing holidays and special occasions, and finding happiness in their many children and grandchildren. The great-grandson of Mrs. Michalos is to be christened after the ceremony for "Holocaust Remembrance Day," and the Velellis will be there to share the joy.

The Michalos family understood well the lesson that Eli Weisel has set down so movingly for us:

We have learned certain lessons. We have learned not to be neutral in times of crisis, for neutrality always helps the aggressor, never the victim. We have learned that silence is never the answer. We have learned that the opposite of love is not hate, but indifference.

TRIBUTE TO CLARENCE MITCHELL, JR.

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, America has lost a great champion of justice and human dignity. Maryland has lost one of the most distinguished citizens over the sweep of her long history, and we have all lost a wise counselor and good friend.

Clarence Mitchell, Jr., through his moral strength, was a powerful force for a better America. He gave his life to the greatest moral challenge of our time—to make the words engraved in stone above the portals of the Supreme Court—"Equal Justice Under Law"—a reality for all Americans.

Clarence understood the power of the rule of law to American democracy. It is fitting that among his greatest monuments are every piece of civil rights legislation enacted in this generation. He knew that officials all across this land take an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States. He knew that if the great moral principles to which he dedicated his life could be

incorporated into the laws of the land, it would transform and redeem our society. It is no accident that today in our law making bodies; national, State and local, are to be found the brother and sons of Clarence Mitchell.

He was the patriarch of a distinguished family. Actually, it was a partnership. A partnership for almost half a century with an outstanding fighter for justice in her own right.

But Clarence was also a patriarch of our Nation. He counseled us wisely and with a deep sense of idealism that drew us always upward to a higher and better standard.

Clarence knew however that the struggle was not over. He knew that we must press on. Only last month, in one of his last speeches to the NEA Conference on Civil Rights, he said:

But it is not enough to keep the memory of past struggles alive. It is not enough to see that the law is administered fully and fairly. There are new rivers to cross, new mountains to climb, and a star toward which we should reach. When we have men and women in office who care about the hungry, who work to shelter the homeless, who want a living wage for even the lowest persons in the work force, who want to end ignorance, who want to provide health care for the sick and economic security for the aged, will we be able to reach that star. When we do, the world will be a better place because we will have set the right example of how humans should live together.

We mourn his death, we celebrate his life, we treasure his friendship and we reaffirm our commitment to the enduring values for which he fought.

I ask that excerpts from Clarence Mitchell's speech to the NEA and several articles about this great leader be printed in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 19, 1984]

CIVIL RIGHTS CHAMPION CLARENCE MITCHELL JR. DIES

(By Martin Weil)

Clarence M. Mitchell Jr., 73, a lifelong champion of equality for blacks who played a key role in winning passage of much of the major civil rights legislation of the 1960s, died last night at the Maryland General Hospital in Baltimore.

As the chief Washington lobbyist for the NAACP for nearly three decades, Mr. Mitchell combined conviction, persistence and quiet persuasive power. In his ultimately successful quest for the landmark measures of the '60s, he displayed skills and talents that won him the sobriquet of "the 101st Senator."

Both as the NAACP's man in Washington, and as a principal in the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, which he helped found, Mr. Mitchell was instrumental in passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Fair Housing Act of 1968.

A lawyer and a former newspaper reporter whose career was galvanized when in 1933 he witnessed his first lynching, Mr. Mitchell was a leading member of a family that in Maryland, his home state, and in Baltimore, his hometown, symbolized civil rights and the NAACP.

Known as a man of courage and integrity, Mr. Mitchell persisted optimistically

through years of resistance and rebuff to seek the common ground and consensus that in time permitted him to witness passage of the bills that helped guarantee equality before the law.

Despite his successes, his name was not nearly so well known to the general public as many of the other principal actors in the social and legislative revolution of the 1960s.

Firmly committed to the goal of full integration of blacks into the American mainstream, Mr. Mitchell shunned the separatist doctrine and militant tactics that might have won him greater visibility.

A modest and unassuming man, whose arena of action was the congressional office and conference room, he neither sought nor attained the broad public recognition to which his accomplishments entitled him.

Before the days in which meaningful civil rights legislation was possible, Mr. Mitchell prompted and promoted advances through executive orders, such as the one by which President Truman demanded the desegregation of the Armed Forces.

During the Eisenhower administration, Mr. Mitchell was credited with guiding to passage the 1957 Civil Rights Act, the first legislation of its kind in years. He was also recognized among legislative insiders and being instrumental in passage of the 1961 act that set up the federal Civil Rights Commission.

Beyond his work in shepherding to passage the civil rights bills of the '60s, Mr. Mitchell is cited as the author of a key section of at least one of them. Title VII of the 1964 bill, which required equal employment opportunity.

As chairman of the leadership conference on civil rights, Mr. Mitchell employed his lobbying skills in helping to bring about the rejection by the Senate of the nominations to the Supreme Court of Clement Haynsworth and G. Harrold Carswell.

Despite the not infrequent bitterness and strong feelings bound up in the long struggle in which Mr. Mitchell was engaged, he was himself viewed as generous and conciliatory towards his foes, often finding it possible to say a good word about all but the harshest among them.

A man who carried a picket sign to help desegregate Baltimore schools, and who was arrested for going through the main door of a South Carolina railroad station, Mr. Mitchell knew the values of direct action.

But, he said, "you've got to know when to stop picketing and sit down at the conference table."

In 1980, the year he left his leadership conference post, and two years after leaving the NAACP post, Mr. Mitchell received the nation's highest civilian honor, the Presidential Medal of Freedom, from President Carter.

He was also appointed as a U.S. representative to the United Nations by President Ford, and at the time of his death, was a member of the board of regents of the University of Maryland, from which he held his law degree.

Mr. Mitchell was born in Baltimore, where he lived for the last four decades at the same inner-city address. His father, a musician, and his mother, a cashier, enforced daily study hours for their seven children, who included Mr. Mitchell's brother, U.S. Rep. Parren J. Mitchell (D-Md.).

"He was one of the most remarkable human beings I've ever met," Rep. Mitchell said last night of his brother.

Sen. Paul Sarbanes (D-Md.) called Mr. Mitchell "a great champion of justice and

human dignity" who was "a powerful force for a better America."

John Toll, president of the University of Maryland, described his death as a "serious loss" for the nation and called him "an inspiring leader" in the work for equality, justice and a better society.

After receiving a bachelor's degree from Lincoln University in Chester, Pa., Mr. Mitchell became a reporter for the Baltimore Afro-American newspaper. The lynching he saw as a newsman in Princess Ann, Md., made him decide on a civil rights career.

After work for the Urban League in the Midwest, he joined the federal government in assignments that included enforcing World War II antidiscrimination orders in shipyards. He was labor secretary of the NAACP from 1945 until becoming director of the Washington bureau in 1950.

In recent years, he and his wife Juanita, the first black woman to practice law in Maryland, were joined by a son, Michael, a Baltimore City Councilman, in the firm of Mitchell, Mitchell and Mitchell. Another son, Clarence III, is in the state legislature.

Survivors include two other sons, Keiffer J., and George D.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Mar. 20, 1984]

A MIGHTY CHANGE: BUT THERE ARE NEW RIVERS TO CROSS

(By Clarence Mitchell)

WASHINGTON.—Twenty years ago we were gearing up for a crucial vote in the Senate on civil rights. The civil rights bill which had been passed by a massive vote of 290 to 130 in the House of Representatives was in danger of being buried in the Senate Judiciary Committee by a hostile chairman, James O. Eastland of Mississippi. Fortunately, under the Senate rules the bill could be brought to the floor without reference to the committee.

Those of us backing the bill supported the move for direct floor consideration. Efforts at the White House and hard work, both in and outside the Senate, paid off. On February 26, 1964, the Senate voted 54 to 37 to put the bill on the calendar instead of sending it to committee. There followed the long fight that was climaxed when the Senate voted 71 to 29 to invoke cloture on June 10. President Johnson signed the bill into law on July 2, 1964.

There is no question about the great value of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. It has made possible changes in our society that some believed could not be accomplished in another hundred years after the abolition of human slavery. The change for the better has been so complete that many of those in our country who were children of tender years in 1964 cannot believe that conditions the law was designed to correct actually existed.

The great names of 1964 like A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins, Whitney Young and James Farmer are somehow merged into a composite that usually mentions only Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Even Dr. King's memory is sometimes blurred by the passage of time and there are those in the new generation who do not know why we honor him.

Thus it seems that one of our first tasks in the education of children is to teach them where we were as a nation before 1964 and how we have gotten to where we are now. We must let them know the price we paid in time, labor, money, property and even human lives to erase the blatant practices of

discrimination and segregation that were our nation's shame. We must also recruit and develop dedicated people to run the agencies created by this law.

But it is not enough to keep the memory of past struggles alive. It is not enough to see that the law is administered fully and fairly. There are new rivers to cross, new mountains to climb and a star toward which we should reach.

The signs saying which entrance blacks may use are down. But there are more deadly ways to bar access. One of these is the use of dubious tests to decide whether an applicant may be admitted to a college, whether a promising young person may be admitted to law or medical school and now there is even a strong move to use a test to decide whether one may be admitted to training to be qualified as a teacher.

I say to you that these tests are like an evil river whose rising waters are a threat to the aspirations of the present generation. They are creating ways to accomplish new discrimination against the victims who do not pass them and wealth for those who devise them. After careful consideration, I have concluded that the trend toward using tests to bar persons from careers of their own choosing or jobs for which they are fully qualified must be stopped. I hope that your great organization will meet the new challenge by carefully developing the facts that will expose and discredit those who are responsible for this monstrous fraud in our times.

For those who are fortunate enough to get past the test obstacle there is another barrier of mountainous proportions. It is the secret method of denying promotions to those who deserve them. How often do we still hear of blacks who train new white employees and then one day the employee that they have trained becomes the boss? How often do we see college campuses where women are employed as assistant or associate professors but somehow do not get tenure?

How often do we read the dreary figures on the income gap between white and black wage earners? Here again there is a challenge that we must meet. We must pierce the veil of deceit and conspiracy that makes these wrongs possible. We must use our best skills, much of our resources and all else that is needed to destroy these practices just as we destroyed the more obvious discriminatory techniques of the past.

In spite of the new obstacles that exist, we have great resources to deal with them. I see these resources when I hear the words and see the accomplishments of a great woman, Mary H. Futrell, who is president of this organization. These resources are apparent when the mayor of Detroit moves to give black policemen opportunities to be promoted on merit and that decision is upheld first by a U.S. District Court judge named Damon Keith. Then Judge Keith's decision is upheld by the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals on which sits the distinguished Judge Nathaniel Jones. All three of these men—the mayor and the two judges—are black. They hold their offices because together we have wrought a mighty change in our land.

Finally, I will say a word about that activity that is perhaps closest to my heart. It is political action. Not long ago I was in Mississippi and heard Dr. Aaron Henry, a member of the House in that state, being called back from a speaking engagement to cast a crucial vote. It was not many years ago that Mississippi's legislature was off limits for

blacks. Now, not only are they there, but they are serving with distinction. Later, I received word that my longtime friend and NAACP stalwart, the Rev. I. deQuincy Newman, had become the first black since Reconstruction to serve in the South Carolina Senate.

In the South and throughout the country there is a rising tide of interest in seeking public office. There is an equal determination to elect qualified candidates and also to make certain that from the highest office down to the most obscure county official we will give early and effective support to those candidates who stand for equal justice and freedom for all people of whatever race, sex, national origin, age or religion.

When we have men and women in public office who care about the hungry, who work to shelter the homeless, who want a living wage for even the lowest persons in the work force, who want to end ignorance, who want to provide health care for the sick and economic security for the aged, we will be able to reach that star. When we do, the world will be a better place because we will have set the right example of how humans should live together.

[From the Baltimore Sun, March 1984]

CLARENCE MITCHELL: MAN WHO WAS ALWAYS THERE

(By Peter Kumpa)

Clarence M. Mitchell Jr., was the man who was always there then the major civil rights laws of the country were written, debated and passed by the Congress.

During a two-year stretch two decades ago, when I covered the civil rights beat in Washington, he was present at every skirmish and at every battle. He was there testifying, listening, helping at the subcommittee level and in the full House Judiciary Committee when the omnibus Civil Rights Bill was written, then passed.

And when the legislation found its way over to the Senate side, he was there as well for every moment of the legislative conflict that eventually led to the smashing of a filibuster before basic civil rights could be written into our laws.

That's the reason that Clarence Mitchell was called the 101st U.S. senator. He was there.

As head of the Washington office of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Mitchell wasn't simply a silent witness to history. For members of Congress, he was the prime source of moral pressure for the cause of racial justice. He advised and cajoled. He exhorted and he pleaded usually privately.

He never seemed defeated. He was always the certain optimist, the one who knew that obstacles were made to be overcome.

For reporters, he was one of these silent sources of information, a man who knew the law, and the history of any given bit of civil rights legislation. And he was always completely up-to-date, the man you checked with daily on the progress of legislation that marked the high-point of the decade of the Sixties. And he was always there.

Clarence Mitchell was not a shouter or a screamer when he testified before Congress. He was a gentle man and a gentleman. He was reasoned passion. He was intellectual persuasion. He was a polished witness for his cause. And he was an effective one.

Only once do we remember him breaking out in anger.

It was in October 1963. Chairman Emmanuel Celler of the House Judiciary Committee had met behind closed doors on and off

for two days with U.S. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy to decide on a new strategy for a stalled omnibus Civil Rights Bill. To win some marginal Democrats and Republican, they decided to strip away some titles that had been approved by a subcommittee.

Celler said he was sorry he had to drop some of the bill. "There's and old Turkish saying that you roll up your pants when you come to the water," he explained. Kennedy backed him up.

Clarence Mitchell was outraged. He talked first to the pencil press, then grabbed the television cameras. "There is no reason for this kind of a sellout," he shouted.

He was particularly angry at provisions in the bill that would weaken powers of the attorney general to intervene in some nasty cases of official brutality in the South. Mitchell stormed that what was left would be "wholly inadequate to deal with police brutality, Negroes subjected to cattle prods, people bombed and thrown out of their own churches."

Meticulous in his preparation, Mitchell had his own count of congressmen to show that the Kennedy administration didn't have to compromise. "I think the administration ought to go and fight," he told Robert Kennedy.

One of the reasons for Mitchell's anger had been the June 1963 assassination of Medgar Evers in Mississippi. He blamed the administration for being "too little and too late" in protecting black civil workers in the South.

In time, Mitchell won his battle. If he were with us today, he could testify that the fight was closely won, never easy and never certain. And if he were here, he would be sure to tell us all that the fight for equal justice is never over and never completely won.

Sunday, Mitchell died at the age of 73, another giant gone from that historic era of change. He leaves us with more than memories. He left so much of his innate decency and wisdom in his writings, much of it in his columns in *The Sun*.

In his native Baltimore, he fought for black advancement in politics. "It must be remembered," he wrote, "black aspirations in politics do not imply hostility towards whites. The goal is a place at the decision-making table and partnership in governing."

Mitchell graduated from Lincoln (Pa.) University in 1932 during the Great Depression, when millions were out of work and the rumblings of war could be heard from across the oceans. Fifty years later, he found that his class had made it and so he could advise today's graduates: "You face conditions of uncertainty and personal risk much like those of our time but, remember, we made it and you, too, can succeed."

Mitchell was the optimist. He had a faith in all of us and in the decency of society.

Mitchell, we should emphasize, was more than an activist for civil rights. He defended the cause of the poor. He fought against anti-Semitism. His cause was far broader as he once noted when he quoted some forgotten lines from the historic August 1963 march on Washington. The memories of Martin Luther King Jr.'s "I have a dream" speech are sometimes so overwhelming that we forget other words that were spoken that day.

A. Philip Randolph, the union leader who conceived the idea for the march, also spoke and Mitchell quoted his lines once as "the best description" of the purpose of the event.

"We are the advance guard of a massive moral revolution for jobs and freedom," said Randolph, "but this civil rights revolution is not confined to the Negro, nor is it confined to civil rights, for our white allies know that they cannot be free while we are not. We want a free democratic society dedicated to the political, economic and social advancement of man along moral lines."

In his lifetime, Mitchell won many, many honors. It would be easy to list them, but I am sure that the child who grew up poor in the 1300 block of little Stockton Street in Baltimore would prefer to be remembered as a man who stood for the advancement of man along moral lines.

[From the Baltimore Afro-American, Apr. 14, 1984]

MEMORIAL SERVICES SET FOR FRIDAY NOON
(By Elizabeth M. Oliver)

BALTIMORE.—Last rites for Clarence M. Mitchell Jr., the longtime National Civil Rights leader, will be in the form of a memorial service, 12 noon, Friday, March 23 at Sharp Street Methodist Church, Dolphin and Etting Streets, Baltimore.

Mr. Mitchell died Sunday, March 18 at 8:32 p.m. at Maryland General Hospital. He was 73.

His body has been donated to science.

The family asks that no flowers be sent. Instead, his widow, Mrs. Juanita Jackson Mitchell, asks that donations be sent to the Lillie Carroll Jackson Museum and the NAACP in care of the office of Attorney Michael Bowen Mitchell, 37th Floor, 222 St. Paul St., Baltimore, MD. 21202.

Mr. Mitchell was stricken with an apparent heart attack Sunday afternoon. He and Mrs. Mitchell, the noted civil rights attorney, walked home about 1 p.m. from Sharp Street Church where the family holds life-long membership. While Mrs. Mitchell, his wife of 46 years, was preparing breakfast in the kitchen, Mr. Mitchell suddenly fell at the dining room table.

He was rushed to Maryland General Hospital, the closest hospital, by ambulance. At his side were his wife, Mrs. Mitchell; brother, Congressman Parren J. Mitchell; sons, City Councilman Michael Bowen Mitchell and George Davis Mitchell.

Summoned by phone were his other sons, Dr. Keiffer J. Mitchell who was in Virginia and State Senator Clarence M. Mitchell III who was in Los Angeles, CA. with his wife.

Mr. Mitchell was for decades in the halls of Congress waging a fight for civil rights of black citizens and was fondly known as the 101st U.S. Senator.

On June 30, 1980 he received the Presidential Medal of Freedom from President Jimmy Carter in the Rose Garden of the White House.

The citation praised him for his stubborn, resourceful and historic campaign for social justice and stated, "The integrity of this 101st Senator has earned him the respect of friends and adversaries alike."

"His brilliant advocacy helped translate into law the protests and aspirations of millions consigned too long to second-class citizenship. The hard won fruits of his labors have made America a better and stronger nation."

Mr. Mitchell retired Dec. 31, 1978 after 32 years as director of the Washington Bureau of the NAACP.

He was the chairman of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights until April 29, 1981 when he became Honorary Chairman of the group of 150 organizations formed 30 years ago.

The Mitchells have resided in their inner city 1324 Druid Hill Ave. residence over 40 years.

Mr. Mitchell's career in civil rights and interest in politics he often said, came as the result of his being assigned as an AFRD reporter in 1932 by Carl Murphy editor of the Baltimore based newspaper.

His most meaningful assignment in 1933, he often told this reporter, was the lynching of George Armwood in Princess Anne, Md. It was then he decided upon his life of fighting for (social justice). He often boasted that he was a "newspaper man" and encouraged young people to go into the field of journalism.

Mr. Mitchell was appointed in 1982 by the governor of Maryland to a 5-year term on the Board of Regents of the University of Maryland.

He was awarded the Spingarn Medal at the NAACP National convention July 1, 1969 in Jackson, MI. for his efforts in obtaining passage of civil rights bills such as the 1957 Civil Rights Act.

Mr. Mitchell was born in Baltimore March 8, 1911, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence M. Mitchell Sr.

In addition to his wife, Mrs. Juanita J. Mitchell, surviving are sons, Dr. Keiffer Jackson Mitchell, physician and surgeon; State Senator Clarence M. Mitchell, III; George Davis Mitchell, contractor; and Michael Bowen Mitchell, the City Council man and attorney, all of Baltimore.

Mr. Mitchell is also survived by two brothers, Congressman Parren J. Mitchell and George Mitchell, retired teacher, both of Baltimore; two sisters, Mrs. Anna Mae Mitchell Gittings, Baltimore; and Mrs. Evelyn Mitchell Ross, Pittsburgh, PA. the eldest, who was confined to the hospital there with a sudden illness Sunday, the same day as her brother.

The grandchildren are Clarence M. Mitchell IV, Lisa M. Mitchell, Keiffer J. Mitchell Jr., Kelley J. Mitchell, Kathleen J. Mitchell, Michael B. Mitchell Jr., Micah M. Mitchell, Cheryl Jennifer Mitchell, Juanita Elizabeth Jackson Mitchell, Karla Kenyatta Mitchell, George Davis Rockford Mitchell Jr., and Lauren E. Mitchell—EMO

Here in part are some of Mr. Mitchell's accomplishments which are listed in the biographical sketch compiled by his family:

His singular efforts led to the passage of the civil rights bills such as the 1957 Civil Rights Act which gave the attorney general of the United States power to institute civil suits to protect the right to vote;

Established the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice and the United States Civil Rights Commission.

The 1964 law forbidding discrimination in place of public accommodation. Establishing an Equal Employment Opportunity Agency and prohibiting discrimination in the expenditure of federal funds.

The 1965 Voting Rights Act which authorizes the appointment of federal examiners to certify eligibility of persons to register and vote, and prohibits literacy tests. The Fair Housing Act of 1968 which outlaws discrimination in the sale and rental of housing and also increases penalties against those who interfere with persons exercising their civil rights.

In 1970 and 1975, Mr. Mitchell and his colleagues led the successful fight to extend the Voting Rights Act's ban against literacy tests for an additional five years. Mr. Mitchell led acceptance of the amendments giving the 19-year-olds the right to vote, which passed.

They joined in supporting the successful effort to pass the 1972 legislation giving enforcement powers to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

In 1978, Mr. Mitchell joined with women's organizations in successfully amending the Equal Employment Opportunity Act to forbid discrimination against women workers during pregnancy and childbirth and to assure their coverage under company health plans. This had been denied under a Supreme Court decision (*Gilbert v. General Electric*).

In 1978 and 1979, Mr. Mitchell worked successfully with others to get the Carter Administration to propose and Congress to approve strengthening civil rights reorganization, including establishing for the first time a top legal civil rights unit in the office of Management and Budget.

Mr. Mitchell has also worked successfully with members of the American Bar Association for increases in salaries for federal judges. He is a former member of the American Bar Association's Commission to Establish a National Institute for Justice.

Mr. Mitchell gave his first Congressional testimony on his eyewitness account of a lynching that occurred in 1933. His government service includes executive posts with President Roosevelt's Fair Employment Practice Committee, the War Production Board. He has also given volunteer services to government committees to which he was appointed by Presidents Truman, Eisenhower and Johnson.

President Ford appointed Mr. Mitchell as member of the five person delegation representing the United States as the Seventh Special Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations beginning in the fall of 1975.

Other members of the delegation were two Ambassadors from the Department of State and two members of the House of Representatives. There were also five alternates.

On Jan. 26, 1976, Democratic and Republican leaders of the United States Senate and House of Representatives offered resolutions honoring Mr. Mitchell for 30 years of legislative service and "expressing gratitude for his contributions to the enhancement of life in America."

The resolutions were passed in both Houses. President Ford also sent a message of commendation. A similar action was taken by the Senate in 1978 on his retirement.

His education is as follows: A. B. Lincoln University, Pennsylvania; graduate work at Atlanta University and the University of Minnesota; Juris Doctor, Law School, University of Maryland; Honorary Doctor of Laws Degrees from Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland; Lincoln University, Oxford, Pennsylvania; Boston University, Boston Massachusetts.

Howard University, Washington, D.C.; Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio; Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters from University of Maryland, College Park, and Western Maryland College, Westminster, Maryland; Honorary Doctor of Civil Law from Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

In 1973, he received the Adam Clayton Powell Award from the Congressional Black Caucus for his contributions in the field of human rights.

In 1983 Senator Charles McC. Mathias appointed Mr. Mitchell to be chairman of his Judicial Merit Selection Committee.

In 1983 Mayor William Donald Schaefer appointed Mr. Mitchell to be a member of his Blue Ribbon Cable T.V. Committee.

Among the notables expected in Baltimore Friday for the memorial service for Clarence M. Mitchell Jr., are Supreme Court Associate Justice Thurgood Marshall, former Senator Ed Brooke, former presidential advisor Louis Martin, Benjamin Hooks, executive director of the NAACP.

Other Civil Rights leaders and legislators expected are Joe Rauh, Arnold Arunson, Senator Charles Mathias, Charles Diggs, Joseph Lowery, John Jacob, Dorothy Height, Jack Greenberg, Randall Robinson, Leon Sullivan, Maynard Jackson, Ralph Neis, Eddie Williams and Senator Paul Sarbanes.●

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

RECESS UNTIL 2 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 2 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:29 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF, TRADE, AND CUSTOMS MATTERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 2163, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2163) to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3027

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, as I indicated earlier during the opening moments of the session today, it would be my purpose to offer an amendment to the pending bill.

For myself, Senators DOLE, DOMENICI, GARN, HATFIELD, LAXALT, TOWER, and STEVENS, I now send that amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) for himself, and Senators DOLE, DOMENICI, GARN, HATFIELD, LAXALT, TOWER, and STEVENS proposes amendment No. 3027.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 25, line 7, strike "Act." and insert the following: "Act."

TITLE II—CIVIL SERVICE PROGRAMS

COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

SEC. 201. (a) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 8340 of title 5, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) the term 'base quarter', as used with respect to a year, means the calendar quarter ending on September 30 of such year; and

"(2) the price index for a base quarter is the arithmetical mean of such index for the 3 months comprising such quarter.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, effective December 1 of each year, each annuity payable from the Fund having a commencing date not later than such December 1 shall be increased by the percent change in the price index for the base quarter of such year over the price index for the base quarter of the latest preceding year in which an increase under this subsection was made, adjusted to the nearest $\frac{1}{10}$ of 1 percent."

(b)(1) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that no adjustment under section 8340(b) of title 5, United States Code (as amended by such subsection), shall be made during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending November 30, 1984.

(2) For purposes of the first increase under subsection (b) of section 8340 of title 5, United States Code (as amended by subsection (a)) after the date of enactment of this Act, an increase under such subsection (as so amended) shall be deemed to have been made effective December 1, 1983.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning with the monthly rate payable for December 1984, any annuity or retired or retirement pay payable under any retirement system for Government officers or employees which the President adjusts pursuant to section 8340(b) of title 5, United States Code (as amended by subsection (a)), shall hereafter be paid no earlier than the first business day of the succeeding month.

(d) Subsection (b) of section 301 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1982 (96 Stat. 790; 5 U.S.C. 8340 note) is repealed.

PAY COMPARABILITY ADJUSTMENT FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

SEC. 202. (a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of fiscal year 1984, the overall percentage of the adjustment under section 5305 of title 5, United States Code, in the rates of pay under the General Schedule, and in the rates of pay under the other statutory pay systems shall be an increase of 3.5 percent.

(2) The adjustment pursuant to paragraph (1) shall take effect on the first day of the first applicable pay period commencing on or after January 1, 1984.

(b) Section 5305 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by inserting "the first January 1 after" before "October 1"; and

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (c)(2), by inserting "the first January 1 after" before "October 1"; and

(3) in subsection (m), by striking out "October 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "the first January 1 after October 1 of the applicable year".

(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of a prevailing rate employee described in section 5342(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, or an employee covered by section 5348 of such title—

(A) any increase in the rate of pay payable to such employee which would result from the expiration of the limitation contained in section 107(a) of Public Law 97-377 (96 Stat. 1909) shall not take effect, and

(B) any adjustment under subchapter IV of chapter 53 of such title to any wage schedule or rate applicable to such employee which results from a wage survey and which (without regard to paragraph (4) of this subsection) is scheduled to become effective during fiscal year 1984 shall not exceed the schedule or rate payable on September 30, 1983 (determined with regard to the limitation contained in section 107(a) of Public Law 97-377) by more than 3.5 percent.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 9(b) of Public Law 92-392 or section 704(b) of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, the provisions of paragraph (1) shall apply (in such manner as the Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe) to prevailing rate employees to whom such section 9(b) applies, except that the provisions of paragraph (1) shall not apply to any increase in a wage schedule or rate which is required by the terms of a contract entered into before October 1, 1983.

(3) The provisions of paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to wage adjustments for prevailing rate supervisors under the supervisory pay plan published in the Federal Register on May 21, 1982 (47 Fed. Reg. 22100).

(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any adjustment in a wage schedule or rate that—

(A) applies to a prevailing rate employee described in section 5342(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, or that applies to an employee who is covered by section 5348 of such title, or who is subject to paragraph (2) of this subsection;

(B) results from a wage survey; and

(C) would take effect, were it not for this paragraph, on or after October 1, 1983,

shall not take effect until the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning not less than 90 days after the day on which such adjustment would, were it not for this paragraph, otherwise have taken effect. The Office of Personnel Management shall take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

DEDUCTION FROM CIVILIAN PAY FOR COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT OF RETIRED OR RETAINER PAY

SEC. 203. Subsection (d) of section 301 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1982 (96 Stat. 791; 5 U.S.C. 5332 note) is repealed.

LEAVE FOR CERTAIN OVERSEAS EMPLOYEES

SEC. 204. Subsection (a) of section 6 of the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act (73 Stat. 214; 20 U.S.C. 904(a)) is amended by striking out "except that—" and all that follows through the end of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "except that if the school year includes more than eight months, any such teacher who shall have served for the entire school year shall be entitled to ten days of cumulative leave with pay."

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT DEPOSITS COVERING
MILITARY SERVICE

SEC. 205. The first sentence of section 306(g) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1982 (5 U.S.C. 8331 note) is amended by striking out "October 1, 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1985".

PAY INCREASES FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES IN
PANAMA

SEC. 206. (a) Section 1225(b)(2) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (Public Law 96-70; 93 Stat. 468) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Each time the rates of basic pay under the General Schedule are increased under section 5305 of title 5, United States Code, the rate of basic pay for each individual referred to in paragraph (1) shall be increased by the amount which is equal to the overall average percentage by which the rates of pay under the General Schedule are increased under such section at such time."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect with respect to basic pay for service performed on or after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 207. (a) For the purposes of this section, the term "covered retirement system" shall have the same meaning as provided in section 203(a)(2) of the Federal Employees' Retirement Contribution Temporary Adjustment Act of 1983 (Public Law 98-168; 97 Stat. 1107).

(b)(1) Any individual who performed service of a type referred to in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of section 210(a)(5) of the Social Security Act beginning on or before December 31, 1983, and who did not make an election under section 208(a) of the Federal Employees' Retirement Contribution Temporary Adjustment Act of 1983 (97 Stat. 1111) before the date of enactment of this Act, may make an election under such section 208(a) not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Any such individual who, before the date of enactment of this Act, made an election under section 208(a) of the Federal Employees' Retirement Contribution Temporary Adjustment Act of 1983 may, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, make any other election which such individual was entitled to make under such section 208(a) before January 1, 1984.

(3)(A) Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, any such individual who, before the date of enactment of this Act, made an election under paragraph (1)(B) or (2)(B) of section 208(a) of the Federal Employees' Retirement Contribution Temporary Adjustment Act of 1983 may elect that sections 201 through 207 of such Act apply with respect to the participation of such individual in a covered retirement system.

(B) Sections 201 through 207 of such Act shall apply in accordance with an election under subparagraph (A).

(4) An election under this subsection shall be made by a written application submitted to the official by whom the electing individual is paid.

(5) An election made as provided in this subsection shall take effect with respect to service performed on or after the first day of the first applicable pay period commencing after the date which is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c)(1) Section 8342(a)(4) of title 5, United States Code, does not apply for the purpose of determining an entitlement to a refund under section 208(c) of the Federal Employ-

ees' Retirement Contribution Temporary Adjustment Act of 1983 (97 Stat. 1111).

(2) Paragraph (1) shall take effect with respect to any election made under section 208(a) of such Act or this Act before, on, or after January 1, 1984.

(d) Nothing in this section or the Federal Employees' Retirement Contribution Temporary Adjustment Act of 1983 affects any entitlement to benefits accrued under a covered retirement system before January 1, 1984, except to the extent that any amount refunded under section 208(c) of such Act is not redeposited in the applicable retirement fund.

TITLE III—SMALL BUSINESS
PROGRAMS

CHANGES IN LAW TO ACHIEVE COST SAVINGS

SEC. 301. The first sentence of section 18(a) of the Small Business Act is amended by striking "1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "1986".

TITLE IV—VETERANS' BENEFITS AND
SERVICES

LIMITATIONS ON LEGISLATION INCREASING
RATES OF BENEFITS

SEC. 401. (a) No legislation that would increase one or more rates of the benefits under chapter 11 or 13 of title 38, United States Code, effective in fiscal year 1984 shall be enacted if such legislation would cause the total costs of legislation increasing such rates in fiscal year 1984 to exceed \$175,500,000 in budget authority or \$145,300,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1984.

(b) In the event that legislation to increase rates of benefits under chapter 11 or 13 of title 38, United States Code, effective in fiscal year 1985 or 1986, is enacted, such legislation shall not take effect before December 1, 1984, or December 1, 1985, respectively.

SECTION 1. Section 201(b)(8) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1781(b)(8)) is amended to read as follows:

"(8) to pay and maintain its deposit and to pay the premium charges for insurance imposed by this title; and"

SEC. 2. Section 202(b) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For each insurance year, each insured credit union which became insured prior to the beginning of that year shall file with the Board, at such time as the Board prescribes, a certified statement showing the total amount of insured shares in the credit union at the close of the preceding insurance year and both the amount of its deposit or adjustment thereof and the amount of the premium charge for insurance due to the fund for that year, both as computed under subsection (c) of this section. The certified statements required to be filed with the Board pursuant to this subsection shall be in such form and shall set forth such supporting information as the Board shall require. Each such statement shall be certified by the president of the credit union, or by any officer of the credit union designated by its board of directors, that to the best of his knowledge and belief that statement is true, correct, and complete and in accordance with this title and regulations issued thereunder."

SEC. 3. Section 202(c) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782(c)) is amended—

- (1) by striking out paragraph (2);
- (2) by redesignating paragraph (1) as paragraph (2);
- (3) by striking out "Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, each" in

paragraph (2), as redesignated, and inserting in lieu thereof "Each";

(4) by striking out "on or before January 31 of each insurance year" in paragraph (2), as redesignated, and inserting in lieu thereof "at such time as the Board prescribes";

(5) by striking out "member accounts" in paragraph (2), as redesignated, and inserting in lieu thereof "insured shares"; and

(6) by inserting before paragraph (2) the following:

"(1) Each insured credit union shall pay to and maintain with the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund a deposit in an amount equaling 1 per centum of the credit union's insured shares. The Board may, in its discretion, authorize insured credit unions to initially fund such deposit over a period of time in excess of one year if necessary to avoid adverse effects on the condition of insured credit unions. The amount of each insured credit union's deposit shall be adjusted annually, in accordance with procedures determined by the Board, to reflect changes in the credit union's insured shares. The deposit shall be returned to an insured credit union in the event that its insurance coverage is terminated, it converts to insurance coverage from another source, or in the event the operations of the fund are transferred from the National Credit Union Administration Board. The deposit shall be returned in accordance with procedures and valuation methods determined by the Board, but in no event shall the deposit be returned any later than one year after the final date on which no shares of the credit union are insured by the Board. The deposit shall not be returned in the event of liquidation on account of bankruptcy or insolvency. The deposit funds may be used by the fund if necessary to meet its expenses, in which case the amount so used shall be expensed and shall be replenished by insured credit unions in accordance with procedures established by the Board."

SEC. 4. Section 202(c)(3) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782(c)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) When, at the end of a given insurance year, any loans to the fund from the Federal Government and the interest thereon have been repaid and the equity of the fund exceeds the normal operating level, the Board shall effect for that insurance year a pro rata distribution to insured credit unions of an amount sufficient to reduce the equity in the fund to its normal operating level."

SEC. 5. Section 202(c)(4) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782(c)(4)) is repealed.

SEC. 6. Subsections (d) through (f) of section 202 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782 (d) through (f)) are amended—

(1) by inserting "its deposit or" before the words "the premium charge" and "any premium charge" each time they appear; and

(2) by striking out "member accounts" and inserting in lieu thereof "insured shares".

SEC. 7. Section 202(g) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "statements, and premium charges" and inserting in lieu thereof "statements, and deposit and premium charges";

(2) by striking out "payment of any premium charge" and inserting in lieu thereof "payment of any deposit or adjustment thereof or any premium charge"; and

(3) by striking out "any premium charge for insurance" and inserting in lieu thereof

"any deposit of adjustment thereof or any premium charge for insurance".

Sec. 8. Section 202(h)(1) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782(h)(1)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", unless otherwise prescribed by the Board".

Sec. 9. Section 202(h)(2) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782(h)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) the term 'normal operating level', when applied to the fund, means an amount equal to 1.3 per centum of the aggregate amount of the insured shares in all insured credit unions, or such lower level as the Board may determine; and".

Sec. 10. Section 202(h)(3) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1782(h)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) the term 'insured shares' when applied to this section includes share, share draft, share certificate and other similar accounts as determined by the Board, but does not include amounts in excess of the insured account limit set forth in section 207(c)(1)."

Sec. 11. Section 203(b) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1783(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "deposits and" before "premium charges"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Board shall report annually to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs of the House of Representatives with respect to the operating level of the fund. Such report shall also include the results of an independent audit of the fund."

Sec. 12. Section 206(d)(1) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1786(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "subsection (a)";

(2) by inserting "maintain its deposit with and" before "pay premiums to the Board"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "Notwithstanding the above, when an insured credit union's insured status is terminated and the credit union subsequently obtains comparable insurance coverage from another source, insurance of its accounts by the fund may cease immediately upon the effective date of such comparable coverage by mutual consent of the credit union and the Board."

Sec. 13. Title III of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1795 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 303 by inserting ", an instrumentality of the United States," after "Central Liquidity Facility" in the second sentence; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"TAX EXEMPTION"

"Sec. 311. (a) The Central Liquidity Facility, its franchise, activities, capital reserves, surplus, and income shall be exempt from all Federal, State, and local taxation now or hereafter imposed, other than taxes on real property held by the Facility (to the same extent, according to its value, as other similar property held by other persons is taxed)."

"(b) The notes, bonds, debentures, and other obligations issued on behalf of the central Liquidity Facility and the income therefrom shall be exempt from all Federal, State, and local taxation now or hereafter imposed: *Provided, That—*

"(1) interest upon such obligations, and gain from the sale or other disposition of such obligations shall not have any Federal

income tax or other Federal tax exemptions, as such, and loss from the sale or other disposition of such obligations shall not have any special treatment, as such, under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or laws amendatory or supplementary thereto, except as specifically provided therein; and

"(2) any such obligations shall not be exempt from Federal, State, or local gift, estate, inheritance, legacy succession, or other wealth transfer taxes."

"(c) For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia; and

"(2) taxes imposed by counties or municipalities, or any territory, dependency, or possession of the United States shall be treated as local taxes."

(b) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1979.

ELIMINATION OF PAYROLL DEDUCTION FEES ON FINANCIAL ORGANIZATIONS; ADMINISTRATION OF DISBURSING FUNCTIONS

Sec. 14. (a) Section 3332(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting "without charge" after "shall be sent".

(b) Section 3332 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsection (c) and redesignating subsections (d), (e) (f), and (g) as subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

Sec. 15. (a) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, to exceed \$299,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, \$333,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, or \$372,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(b) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective committee on appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for non-defense discretionary activities to exceed \$137,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1985, \$144,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1986, or \$151,400,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(c) For the purposes of this section, budget authority shall be determined on the basis applicable for fiscal year 1984.

(d) The provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section may be waived or suspended in the Senate by a majority vote of the Members voting, a quorum being present, or by unanimous consent of the Senate.

(e) It is the sense of Congress that the unprecedented magnitude and persistence of current and projected Federal budget deficits must be addressed in a comprehensive strategy to moderate increases in defense spending while continuing the effective constraints on non-defense discretionary programs. To assure the success of such an initiative, the foregoing procedural restraints, in addition to the total aggregate spending limitations pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, are necessary on budget authority both for defense and for non-defense discretionary programs for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987.

Mr. BAKER. In a moment, Mr. President, I will yield the floor. It is my understanding that the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, will seek recognition, and that during his re-

marks will explain the contents of this amendment. But first, Mr. President, may I say that the amendment that I have just sent to the desk completes what some have referred to as the "Rose Garden agreement." I have referred to this amendment as phase two of the Senate deficit reduction effort.

As many of us painfully recall, the Senate completed phase one on April 13, at about 5 o'clock in the morning by a vote of 76 to 5. I refer to the Finance Committee amendment which was offered to the pending bill. The Senate now has before it the entirety of the agreement reached through literally weeks of tough, tough negotiations among our colleagues in the Senate, and with the President and his advisers. It represents great sacrifices and substantial concessions by all of the parties involved in those negotiations. For example, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator HATFIELD, has agreed to accept statutory caps on appropriations bills for the next 3 years which is a major agreement on behalf of Senator HATFIELD in order to achieve this agreement.

The Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) who is the able chairman of the Armed Services Committee, together with the President, the Secretary of Defense, and their staff have agreed to accept defense caps which are much lower than originally contemplated, and much lower I suspect than they feel is desirable under the circumstances. But they have agreed to them in the course of extensive negotiations trying to reach this package agreement.

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) who is the chairman of the Budget Committee, and who will carry much of the burden of debate on this amendment now pending, has agreed perhaps to higher defense numbers than he thought were prudent under all of the circumstances given our fiscal plight. But he has agreed, as have other parties to this agreement on many other matters.

In short, Mr. President, this is not a perfect arrangement. But I believe it is a good arrangement. After the weeks of negotiations and the compromises undertaken, I am convinced that this is the best arrangement that we can make. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to seriously consider this proposition in the context that, if we do not do this or something very much like it, there probably is not going to be anything passed by both Houses and presented to the President for his signature.

Perhaps the most common complaint I hear about the entire package is that it is not big enough, that \$140 or \$150 billion in deficit reduction will have no effect. Mr. President, I do not

agree with that. But more importantly, Mr. President, I am convinced that this is the best we can do.

To paraphrase a French philosopher, it is a crime to do nothing for fear that you can do too little.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will consider carefully the proposal that is now before it in the form of this amendment, that we will proceed deliberately to debate it, to amend it, if necessary, and to pass it as a further step in the completion of a package arrived at by difficult negotiations, and calculated to produce the best result obtainable under the circumstances.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. The distinguished majority leader has spoken of negotiations which have occurred between, I take it, the Senate and the White House. Were any Members on this side of the aisle involved in those negotiations?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, they were not, but I am sure the minority leader will recall that the President of the United States in his State of the Union message asked for a bipartisan approach to a downpayment on the budget deficit. And, indeed, there were meetings by Members on both sides of the aisle from the House and Senate, with representatives of the President, and I might say in all candor I think without much result. At that point—I accept responsibility for suggesting that—when those negotiations appeared to be unproductive, it was better to go forward with negotiations between representatives in the House and Senate and the administration than to do nothing at all. And the arrangement that I speak of is the product of that series of negotiations.

Let me say parenthetically that I have been in the Senate a while now, and in the leadership for almost 8 years, either as minority or majority leader. I have never seen a President of the United States as directly involved over such a period of time as this President was in these negotiations with Members of his own party. If my memory serves me, there were four separate meetings in the Cabinet room of the White House, and a total of 7½ or 8 hours of active participation with the President of the United States in these negotiations.

The only reason I say that is to tell my colleagues in the Senate—and my friend, the minority leader, in particular—that these were serious and difficult negotiations. And I did not mean to imply that they were negotiations on a bipartisan basis with the administration. That was tried, and did not succeed for whatever reason. But nonetheless, they were serious, extensive, difficult, and sometimes painful, but I believe successful negotiations

looking toward an effort to reduce the size of the Federal deficit.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the majority leader. I have no doubt that what he said is the exact truth regarding recent negotiations, which were apparently different from those that occurred early on and in which the Democrats did participate from this body and the other body. Even the proposals that were advanced on that occasion by my friends from the other side of the aisle, in this body, were said to be off limits, and not "on the table" for resolution. According to the news reports, the people who represented the White House, or at least one or more of them, indicated that they were merely "observers" when proposals were made in good faith by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) and others. So, I am pleased to hear that the President and the White House have lately really become serious, and have contributed to the negotiations to which the distinguished majority leader has referred.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, anticipating that the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee will wish to seek recognition, I not only yield the floor, but I suggest that he take my place as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader.

I am hopeful that I will be able this afternoon to explain to everyone the details of this proposal.

I think for the most part they are understood in terms of their expected result, since we have a 3-year enforceable cap on total defense budget authority and appropriations. Since that is separate and distinct from a 3-year cap on the rest of the appropriated accounts, starting with 1985 and running through 1986 and 1987, and since that is also enforceable by a point of order, this becomes more like a budget resolution in many respects, except for its enforceability and the enforceable nature of its caps. In a sense, while it is similar, it is genuinely different than anything we have done heretofore, to my knowledge. But the effect of the composite or total budget authority that we are attempting to get the Senate to agree to here today, which is close to a freeze on 1985 versus 1984 in terms of domestic appropriated accounts, and about a 5-percent growth in each of the 2 successive years, in the sense that it is cumulative budget authority from whence appropriators appropriate their particular and respective domestic appropriated bills, it is much like a budget resolution.

So in that respect, we have done a lot of work in the Budget Committee in adopting a resolution which is, for all intents and purposes, similar, in effect, to the final product here, the so-called Boat Act, as amended by the tax bill, as amended by the entitlement reconciliations, as supplemented by the entitlement bill which passed, a small one, as supplemented by these caps. It is very much like the budget resolution.

So in that respect, we would be available to answer questions with reference to the effect, with reference to the outyear economics, and with reference to the outyear deficits.

Having said that, consistent with previous floor actions, I ask unanimous consent that staff members from the majority and the minority, as we did heretofore, have floor privileges during the consideration of this amendment. I have cleared this matter with Senator CHILES with respect to the professional staff. I send that list of staff personnel to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, with reference to the need for calculators occasionally here on the floor, and this has been cleared and is consistent with our previous activities, I ask unanimous consent that the use of small electronic calculators be permitted to be used on the floor during the consideration of this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes. I know there are no time agreements on any of this, but just so that I will be able to judge how much time I am using, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. President, deficit-reduction action on H.R. 2163, the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, in all likelihood, will be the final component to a major deficit reduction downpayment this year. In fact, if the leadership amendment is agreed to, we will have also completed unfinished business of the last session, by incorporating provisions of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1983—S. 2062.

I want to say to the distinguished leader of the minority, when I say that I am in no way talking about it becoming a reconciliation bill at this point, I am merely talking about the contents being transferred to legislation and being part of this amendment and the rest of it was part of the finance package, neither of which are, per se, reconciliation, but normal amendments with all of the prerogatives of anyone and none of the inhibitions which would attach if and when it becomes a reconciliation bill.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator for that information.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this amendment implements those provisions of the Republican leadership plan announced by the President back on March 15, and either not enacted to date or not already included in the Senate Finance Committee amendment adopted before we went on the holiday recess. As important, this amendment also implements the budget and fiscal policies as embodied in the Senate Budget Committee's recently reported Senate Concurrent Resolution 106, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985.

I mentioned that in my brief opening remarks, prior to my prepared remarks. We did adopt a budget resolution, as the distinguished Presiding Officer recalls, after lengthy debate and alternative plans. I merely want to acknowledge again that if this amendment is adopted and incorporated into the so-called Boat Act, as amended, it will be consistent with the budget resolution that was recently adopted by the Budget Committee.

No one should misunderstand what the essence of this amendment means. By adopting this amendment, along with the Finance Committee amendment already agreed on, we will have accomplished what few thought we would do this year. We will have taken the first major step, a responsible and realistic step, toward reducing the projected deficits. Combined with the two bills recently signed by the President—the Agricultural Programs Adjustment Act of 1984 and the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1983—H.R. 4169—and the resulting reductions in net interest expenditures, the Senate will have acted in a responsible manner to reduce the Federal deficit by \$144 billion between now and fiscal year 1987.

I want to say to the Senate, there will be those who will choose to call the \$144 billion a different number because they will choose a different starting line. I can give you whichever you prefer, but basically, for consistency, we have used the same baseline as the House used in its budget resolution, in its tax bill, when they discussed how much they were reducing the deficit, when they voted in the Budget Committee on what the defense numbers would be, and concluded with their deficit reduction package for 3 years. They used the same baseline that we are talking about here which yields \$144 billion between now and 1987.

Some will argue we should do more, and I would not totally disagree. We should do more and we will. But let us not be fooled into waiting for a perfect package and fail to act on the good package we have before us.

I think we are all pleased by the recent excellent economic news, reflecting a robust recovery with low levels of inflation, increasing employ-

ment, and increasing personal consumption.

Incidentally, I see that my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Florida, has arrived on the floor. Not only am I pleased that he is here and that we will be involved for the next few days—hopefully not weeks—deciding which of the various proposals we adopt, but I am very pleased that he is here healthy, safe, and sound. I have not yet had a chance to get an indepth briefing of the situation he found himself in Central America, but, needless to say, I am pleased that everything went well and that the Senator is safe.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining on my first 15 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time is not under control, but the Senator has spoken for approximately 5½ minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Florida, I understand time is not under control, but for purposes of trying to adjust and to accommodate others, I yielded myself 15 minutes at the start.

Economic growth, measured by the rise in the real growth national product, topped 8.3 percent in the first quarter of the year. Industry is running at 80.9-percent capacity, the highest rate since August 1981. The number of individuals employed is also at an all time high—103.9 million. Yet this good news should not blind us to our responsibilities. We shall hear a lot about that, the fact that economic news is good and the economy is growing well, with whatsoever soft spots it has, but we certainly have to be concerned about the deficit. The Senator from New Mexico does not disagree. The economic recovery will not continue unaffected by burgeoning deficits. We must sustain the recovery by acting now on this package, as I see it.

It has been said on the floor so many times before that the most important economic issue confronting Congress today is the projected growth in Federal deficits, both in absolute terms and as a percentage of our total national income. Fortunately, we still have the time and opportunity to act aggressively on a "first installment" toward deficit reduction.

Do we have the courage and will power to confront this issue? I implore my fellow Senators not to let this opportunity escape us, for I fear that this will be the last opportunity the 98th Congress has to make meaningful reductions in the deficit. Of course, we shall soon have a chance to consider the reported first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985.

As I indicated, that will follow this action and we shall either act consistently therewith or inconsistently, in either event. I am hopeful we shall take up the budget resolution shortly thereafter and accommodate it to what has transpired. I shall be more

than pleased in due course, if someone would like to know my reasoning as to why we approached in that way, I shall be happy to provide that.

But if this amendment fails, we will have effectively defeated the same policies embodied in that resolution. While no one was overjoyed or totally pleased with that resolution, obviously, it did make a significant dent and did make some substantive changes in the law that were meaningful. So, passing this amendment, as part of this total package, is critical. We owe no less to the people of this country who want deficits reduced.

At this time let me briefly summarize the provisions included in this amendment. The amendment is based on the general concept of shared responsibility. Reducing the current and projected deficit will require that everyone give a little and that most of our preconceived ideas of what the best policy is with reference to various aspects of our national commitment, either to our defense or to our social commitments, require that most of those particular policies give a little. As a result, we can readily see that this is broken into three parts: national defense, nondefense discretionary programs, and the entitlement programs. Federal taxpayers, corporate and individual, will also share in that responsibility, as already adopted by the Senate.

First, the amendment would set the aggregate level of appropriations for our national defense spending at \$299.0 billion in fiscal year 1985, \$333.7 billion in fiscal year 1986, and \$372.0 billion in fiscal year 1987. Compared to the President's request for national defense spending this year, these figures represent nearly a \$57.0 billion reduction in appropriations and we estimate a \$40.2 billion reduction in outlays over this 3-year period.

I remind my friends and colleagues in the Senate that we do not appropriate outlays as much and as often as Senators continue to ask what is the outlay effect. That is for the most part a genuine estimate, although we are getting better at it because we know the components. But basically, we appropriate budget authority.

While this is a major reduction from the President's request. It still assumes 5.4 percent real rate of growth in defense spending, and it holds defense spending to 7.2 percent of GNP by fiscal year 1987. That 5.4 percent average is figured off CBO, as I understand it, in terms of their deflator, if you like, which is what we have used throughout the budget in terms of the effect of inflation on the accounts of Government.

Second, the amendment would set the aggregate level of appropriations for nondefense discretionary spending in fiscal year 1985, at the present

fiscal year 1984 level, taking into account all those items that we are certain will be adopted in supplementary appropriations for the remainder of the year to get to the 1984 level.

This has been done in conjunction with and cooperation with the Appropriations Committee chairman and staff in terms of arriving at the numbers of the chairman and his staff with reference to the language included in this amendment.

After fiscal year 1985, this aggregate appropriation level would be adjusted for inflation as contained in the January CBO economic forecast, roughly 5 percent a year. In the aggregate, non-defense discretionary appropriated spending would be \$137.8 billion in fiscal year 1985, \$144.2 billion in fiscal year 1986, and \$151.4 billion in fiscal year 1987. I want it to be made very clear that this amendment does not take away from the Appropriations Committee its critical responsibility of determining how to allocate the aggregate funding level among the hundreds of accounts, as they see it, and programs, on the basis of need and priorities as they see it. The amendment simply sets a cap on the total funding for these programs over the next 3 years. This provision, it is estimated, will reduce nondefense discretionary spending by \$15.2 billion in outlays through fiscal year 1987.

Finally, the amendment completes the unfinished business of last year's Senate reconciliation bill—S. 2062—by encompassing those provisions of S. 2062 that have not already been included in H.R. 4169.

In some of those provisions, the Senate will recall, we clearly indicated when we adopted House Resolution 4169 we would have a later opportunity to make the changes. We have done that here. I think the distinguished Senator from Florida raised that point with reference to a couple of the items that were not exactly as we thought reconciliation demanded, so they are in this amendment.

The bill affecting civil service and military retiree COLA delays and other provisions—signed into law last week; and those spending provisions in S. 2062 not already adopted in the Finance Committee amendment to this bill, which was adopted before the recess. In total these remaining provisions of S. 2062 result in deficit reductions of \$2.6 billion.

This \$2.6 billion is made up of two major provisions.

First, the amendment achieves \$1.6 billion in additional pay raise savings, primarily by delaying payment of the military retiree COLA adjustment to each January 1, to be comparable with all other Federal and social security retirement payments. Currently, military retirees will receive payments on December 31.

The remaining \$1 billion outlay savings is achieved through increasing the capitalization of the National Credit Union insurance fund. This would bring the ratio of equity to insured shares of this fund up to a level comparable with other Federal insurance funds. The Senate Banking Committee has recently reported this legislation, and it is a part of this amendment.

Certainly if there are those who wish to inquire into it, we shall have the chairman and others who are part of that answer those details.

The amendment now before us leaves out a few sections that I was hopeful we could get accomplished. It does not address concerns about the Small Business Administration disaster loans enacted in H.R. 4169. My distinguished colleague, Senator WEICKER, outlined those concerns during Senate debate on H.R. 4169 on April 5. I simply say that unless the administration and Congress enforce the ceilings on SBA disaster lending—H.R. 4169 contains those caps and ceilings—the actual savings will not be achieved.

I must conclude by making it very clear that by supporting this amendment the Senate is doing more than the aggregate deficit reduction figures it suggests. Combined with the tax and spending measures already included, deficit reduction actions to date, and the resulting net interest savings, we will have a total balanced and responsible—and I would add realistic—deficit package and using the baseline that I described it will be at least \$144 billion. It is a start. I am firmly convinced, all things considered, it will send an important and significant message—and indeed our country will receive it as such and the financial markets will receive it as such—that the Senate will not be paralyzed into inaction as could be the case. We will avoid gridlock on a budget that I have feared for the last couple of years. That fear was growing this year, and I assumed there would indeed be a budget gridlock with no consolidated effort. Rather I anticipated pieces of legislation spread out over 7 or 8 months, probably lending themselves to a less significant package and less balance than is contained in this amendment.

Mr. President, have I used the 15 minutes that I yielded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has spoken for 15 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor at this point.

Mr. CHILES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I should like to first acknowledge the kind remarks of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Mexico, by telling him I am

happy to be back. I appreciate his concern and the concerns so many Members of this body and staffs raised about the welfare of Senator JOHNSTON and myself. We are happy to be back.

Mr. President, I also take this opportunity to congratulate the Senator from New Mexico for the dedicated work he continues to do in the budget process. I was crusading for the Budget Committee to have the chance to consider the budget package, and all of the parts of this plan. Much of it had been worked out in meetings between the Republican Senators and some of the Republican House Members and the administration. We were finally successful in following the process. I think we held good hearings, and had a good markup session. It did not take too long, yet all members were able to express their views. At the conclusion, the majority, under the able direction of the chairman, was able to vote out their package. It was a narrow vote, but it was successful and that is the package that we now have on the floor. I, therefore, appreciate that we did have the opportunity to go to the Budget Committee, where I think our work should be done, and we have duly reported out something from the Budget Committee to the floor.

Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes to talk about a procedure that we are now embarking upon because I think it is one that does have some peril to it. We are talking about a course that changes the way we have done business in the past and perhaps is something that could set some precedents that members of the majority as well as members of the minority might live to regret. We are talking now about amending a minor revenue bill from the House, the so-called boat bill, with the package that has come out of the Budget Committee, part of which is in the nature of a reconciliation. It is expected that the Parliamentarian may rule, upon the adoption of that amendment, that the minor boat bill has taken on the characteristics of a reconciliation measure. Therefore, it would be under the Budget Act and would be entitled to all the strictures the act imposes. Historically, I think we have to realize that when we created the Budget Act we adopted, some restrictions to the act that completely changed the way the Senate ordinarily does its business. We changed the rules of debate. We changed the time requirements. We changed the procedures in regard to germaneness which are normally followed under Senate procedure.

The reason we did that, Mr. President, was because we felt it was going to be necessary. This budget process was so important that we wanted to make sure that someone could not un-

necessarily delay it. We wanted to be able to get up a budget resolution that the Senate could work its will upon, and that could then be combined with the work product from the House to govern and control our spending.

At the time we were devising those extraordinary powers I do not think anybody contemplated we would be working from a future year into a past year. I do not think anybody contemplated we were going to perhaps be waiving germaneness by a vote of 51, a bare majority, and I know no one at that time thought we would have substantive legislative changes made as a part of reconciliation. We now see that has happened. We have a bad precedent. But, Mr. President, to add to that bad precedent by going in this direction and attempting to waive germaneness with 51 votes is something on which I want to raise a warning flag. I hope, before we reach that point, both sides of the aisle will work out an accommodation that we will proceed along the lines of a unanimous-consent agreement rather than attempt to waive germaneness in this body. I think waiving germaneness would be a procedure we would all rue once it had been established because it would be available in the future then for whomever had a majority in this body. And history tells us that one party does not control this body forever. We on this side of the aisle had the feeling that we would control for a long period of time, but we had an awakening.

Mr. President, I raise that issue because as we go forward with this debate I hope the leadership will be conferring on both sides of the aisle. I hope there will be an attempt to work out an accommodation so that if there is going to be a package, that package will be something we go forward on with a unanimous-consent agreement from the body rather than establishing bad precedent.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield?

I take it the Senator is going to move to another subject. I want to comment on the one he just addressed.

Mr. CHILES. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. Indeed, I do not intend at all in this comment to be argumentative. Basically, I just would like, since the Senator was not here when I made my original opening remarks and certainly there was no reason for him to be, to comment on where we are and where we will be until we have adopted this amendment or the amendment amended.

As I understand the parliamentary situation and the leader's request, there is nothing about the pending amendment, I say to the Senator, as to time or germaneness requirements, nor are any waived in terms of it.

It is expected that all competing amendments, substitutes, appropria-

tion amendments, medicare amendments, and anything else will be dealt with.

I say to my good friend from Florida that they will not be dealt with in the framework of measuring their germaneness or their relevance under the Budget Act and reconciliation, but under the normal rules of the Senate.

There is some indication that at some later date, later in the process, there may be a desire on the part of the leadership to move to reconciliation, but I assure the Senator that we are fully aware of the points he has raised.

The Senator is correct: We had a budget markup the week before the recess. Clearly, it was the desire of the Senator from Florida and others that we do that before we take up this kind of amendment.

In addition, there was genuine concern on the tax bill about reconciliation. As the Senator knows, that was done in the normal process. That is why we were here until 5 in the morning—not that we have not been late on a reconciliation bill. That 20 hours frequently takes 2 weeks, as the Senator from Florida knows. There are no germaneness inhibitions, no time inhibitions, unless and until the Senate agrees to them, as to this amendment and the amending process.

Having said that, I want the Senate to know that converting a House bill to reconciliation is neither a new precedent nor a procedural maneuver to limit debate or qualify amendments. I am not suggesting that we are there now, but the Senator indicated that it might be some kind of precedent. It may be precedent-setting in some other respect, but the precedents for converting a House bill to reconciliation are at least twofold.

One was H.R. 5559, in the 94th Congress. That was when we were not in the majority. As the Senator indicated, this has a tendency to switch, at least in the last few years. That was in 1975, the first reconciliation bill ever. We converted H.R. 5559 to a reconciliation bill.

The second time was in 1982, in the 97th Congress, under the majority leadership of Senator BAKER. H.R. 4961 was the Miscellaneous Revenue Act, and it was converted to reconciliation. As the Senator from Florida knows, it then became known as TEFRA, the reconciliation tax measure.

So, while the Senator's arguments are correct with reference to not seeing reconciliation used more often than it should be and in situations that are less than desirable and that do change the rules of the Senate and make it easier to get things done with the 51-vote rule, I merely suggest that the aspect of converting a House bill has already been established by the

majority when it was Democratic and the majority when it was Republican.

Nonetheless, that is not before the Senate at this point, and clearly it is up to our leader and others to decide when it might be requested with reference to this particular amendment.

Mr. CHILES. I think the Senator is correct.

In my remarks, I pointed out that this time I was raising the warning flag, and that I hoped we would not set a precedent by waiving germaneness with 51 votes.

I also started my remarks by saying that I was pleased that we have gotten to the Budget Committee. I am pleased that we are now operating in this amending process under the normal Senate rules in which we do not have time constraints and do not have germaneness constraints.

I was simply raising the caveat that I hoped we would be very careful before we changed that procedure, and I hoped that the leadership on both sides would confer, and that even if it were necessary to go forward with the reconciliation package, we try to do that by a unanimous-consent agreement, rather than setting a precedent of going forward with a bare majority vote.

Mr. President, I have a few opening remarks about the amendment before the Senate. For the first time, in the amendment before us, we are talking about spending caps.

In order that everyone will understand, these would be binding restrictions placed upon the Appropriations Committee, against which, if they were breached, points of order would lie. It would become possible to strike down appropriations. That is new. We have not had binding caps before. We have not had these binding procedures.

The Budget Committee has had problems with other committees in the past. We have had some problems with reconciliation, where we have instructed committees that they had to make certain savings. We have had problems with the Appropriations Committee where we have set overall spending limits. Prior to this, the Appropriations Committee could adjust those spending limits as they desired.

I will say that the process has matured. In recent years, the Appropriations Committee has done a much better job in following the general directions—not of the Budget Committee, but the general direction of Congress. We had set certain funding totals for different functions of government, such as defense, such as public roads and highways, and such as public education. The Appropriations Committee has been following those. They were set not by the Budget Committee but by Congress, after a vote on the budget resolution.

However, this would go further and would say, for the first time: "You can't depart from these figures. You can't spend more than these figures allow."

So, given the fact that we have these caps, I think we want to examine them. I hope the Senate will examine them, and I hope the people will understand the areas we are talking about capping.

What are we dealing with here? First, we are dealing with all the non-defense discretionary programs of Government, and by that we are leaving out the so-called entitlements, those that are set by formulas, programs such as social security, and programs in which the people have a right to make a claim against the Government, based upon their age, their income, and other criteria. Those are the so-called entitlement programs. We are not dealing with those.

In dealing with our normal programs for which we appropriate, excluding defense, the plan before us now calls for a freeze on most programs to last year's spending figure, for the first year, and then a 5-percent growth for the next 2 years.

There are savings I think all of us know can be made in these discretionary programs. There are savings we should make. But when we make a freeze and we tell the Appropriations Committee that we have frozen those programs, then I think we get into an area in which we are going to have some problems. Are we going to freeze all the law enforcement programs? Are we going to freeze aid to dependent children?

That means, of course, that there could be no increase for inflation, no increase based upon the fact that there are changing numbers of employees. That would limit the ability to adjust these programs. We hope to present a plan, which we will discuss in more detail tomorrow, that will allow some flexibility in that regard.

That would mean cutting personnel in our VA hospitals, in our scientific research, in education for the disadvantaged, and in job training. In order for those people to be able to take a freeze where the vast majority of their payroll is in personnel, they would simply have to reduce their personnel and that would cut their programs.

In addition, though, Mr. President, what I wish to talk about is suddenly in this capping process there is a different standard applied to defense. And remember the theory of the cap is that we are afraid the Appropriations Committee will spend more money in these areas than we want them to spend and we need to put some kind of restrictions on the Appropriations Committee. We assume they will not follow the general direction of Congress in its resolution, although they have over the last several years. But

the notion expressed here is that we do not trust the Appropriations Committee and we do not think they will follow it, so we are going to make this a binding freeze.

What else is in here? There is a cap on defense. When I look on that cap on defense, Mr. President, I do not find that to be a moneysaver. That cap on defense is a little bit different than I find in these other areas. That so-called cap on defense adds more than we were spending last year, and we were spending last year at a 5-percent increase in real terms, 5 percent more than the inflation over the year before. But in addition to that 5 percent, we see additional money.

We are told in the opening remarks of the distinguished chairman that there are some savings in defense. I think we have to examine that more closely. Where do these savings come from? These savings come from the President's wish list for defense. That is what he would have liked for defense this year. It is continuation of what his wish list was last year. Congress did not give him that wish list last year. We held him to a 5-percent real growth, more than we had any other program growing, and defense is probably going to grow more this year than we have any other program growing. But the President's wish list was not 5 percent in addition to inflation; it was 12 or 13 percent.

So now, the chairman says we have cut defense because we are not going to give the President his 12 or 13 percent; we are only going to give him 7 percent, so he is not going to get as much as he wished for. That is supposed to be a cut in defense.

Now, I hear the talk that we did not spend the full 5 percent, that the Appropriations Committee that we are so afraid of and want to cap, saved more money last year than we told them that they had to save. They did not spend as much on defense as we have allowed them to spend. They saved some money.

But now we are saying that we are not going to start from where they left off last year. Oh, no. We are going to start back from where the President's wish list was. Yet we are not doing that for any other program, Mr. President, where we saved billions of dollars in the other discretionary programs. Just in education we saved \$2.5 billion. But we are not starting off from there. We are starting back to where we actually left them last year.

So we find in here that we have sauce for the goose but not sauce for the gander, depending upon the program. I think as we examine this amendment we find that the reason for the cap evaporates if we are saying the cap is intended to target savings. The cap actually puts defense at a higher figure, 2 percent higher than

we actually appropriated the year before.

So rather than locking in savings, it is almost an effort to direct that we are going to spend more.

Now, granted the Appropriations Committee, thank goodness, in its wisdom, could elect to spend less than that 7 percent if they so desired. I trust they would exercise that wisdom.

But it is hard to find the real reason for these binding caps which would permit points of order to be raised by any Members of the body to knock down appropriations and see that those caps will be binding in areas that cover all of the domestic areas of Government. The reason it is hard to see is because, when it comes to defense, we have actually added more than Congress spent last year, and more than I think it is ultimately going to spend this year.

Mr. President, we must finally determine how do we really compare plans? How do we really determine what the numbers are? How do we determine what our savings will be? That is difficult. It is difficult for us in Congress. It is certainly more difficult for the lay people outside who are trying to understand it.

In order to make some kind of order out of the chaos, to try to set a common yardstick or a common set of denominators, we established the Congressional Budget Office. They were to be the professional moderator, tempering the claims of Presidents with unbiased analysis. CBO was not to be a partisan. It was to be highly professional. We were going to allow them to set the standard of measurement. They were to be a kind of National Bureau of Standards. On budget matters CBO would determine the length of a yard. They would set up a neutral and objective system of weights and measures, so that their numbers could be the basis of comparison.

Now, I think on this side of the aisle we have continually tried to use those numbers. We have continued to try to say we will allow CBO to set those rules of the game and we all play from those rules.

But there is something about Presidents who do not want to follow those rules. And I will have to say Democratic Presidents in the past have sometimes tried to sidestep the rules of CBO, so it is not something unique to Republican Presidents. No President enjoys CBO rules. Presidents want to make up their own budget rules.

But Congress should use those rules, and observe those rules. We would be better off starting from there.

If we use those rules to examine the plan now before us, we see a plan that comes out entirely different than if you calculate from the President's wish list and what the President says,

Then we find the President's plan does not have the \$150 billion he claims. This is to be a 3-year plan. Do we not have to ask ourselves the question at the end of 3 years if we adopt this amendment how much better off will we be, how much money will we have saved?

The Congressional Budget Office says that we will save \$89 billion if we adopt this plan without any amendments. We will save \$89 billion over 3 years.

I hear this plan described as saving \$150 billion. That is difficult for me to understand. I know it is a heck of a lot more difficult for lay people to understand. But I want everyone to know that the National Bureau of Standards that we created, the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpolitical professional budget office, says \$89 billion. That is the same office that says defense will not grow at the 5-percent rate claimed by the White House, but rather at 7.2 percent. That is a 7.2-percent increase in defense over 3 years, in addition to inflation. And we are supposed to bind that into caps, Mr. President, because we are concerned about spending and we want to be able to lock this in so we are not going to have any more spending. The trouble is we are actually raising military spending in this particular plan.

At an appropriate time we will put a plan on the table that we think will make at least \$150 billion in savings, \$150 billion off of the National Bureau of Standards yardstick, real savings. It would actually reduce the deficit and give us a chance to sustain this recovery. But we will discuss this in greater detail at another time.

Why are these figures important? Well, I think they are important in the context of realizing that all of the witnesses that appeared before the Budget Committee—whether it was the Chairman of the Federal Reserve System, Mr. Volcker; whether it was the head of the Congressional Budget Office; or whether they were economists, almost all that have appeared before us, whether they be conservative or liberal economists—they all told us we had to seriously cut the \$200 billion deficit. They said we had to take enough of a bite out of it this year to keep the recovery going. They knew it was an election year, but they cautioned the job had to be done. And that is why we have spent as much time on the floor with the tax bill, why we have spent our time in the Budget Committee, and why we will debate in the next few days in this Senate Chamber. We have got to do something. We must make deficit reductions of at least \$150 billion, and show, at the end of 3 years, that the deficit is going down and not going up.

Well, if we want to apply that yardstick to the plan before us, we see that the deficits go from—the deficits

would go from \$180.7 billion in 1985 to \$203.5 billion in 1987.

Regardless of what standards you want to apply—and this same trend will be there regardless of whose numbers you use—those deficits are not going down; they are going up. That is the worst signal that we could send. That is not the signal that we want to send to Wall Street, to the financial brokers and to the people that are making decisions on interest rates. That would be the worst of all signals. And that probably is the signal that would say we will not have a chance to come back after the elections in 1985 and fix this before the economy goes off into another downspin.

That I think is going to be the key and the crux of our discussions today and tomorrow and until we adopt this plan. How can we unite the Senate in a meaningful deficit reduction plan? I have no pride of authorship in any plan and I hope no Democrats do. But I want to see that we produce some package that makes the deficit smaller in 1986 than it was in 1985 and smaller in 1987 than it was in 1986. That is the most important signal that we need to send.

I look forward to working together to make this reduction. I think that this will be a healthy debate for the country. We do have an opportunity to make a real reduction.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, was the Senator from Florida finished?

Mr. CHILES. I am happy to yield for a question or yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. I just wanted to comment, so I do not need the Senator to yield. If the Senator is finished, I will seek recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABDNOR). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me say that I hope in the days to come we can debate with more specificity and with more details as to what these various plans are going to do. But let me make sure that my colleagues understand a few of the realities.

First of all, my good friend from Florida, the distinguished ranking minority member of this committee, has a plan, a program, an approach. And so we will have it all in perspective as to how things are growing and how things are not growing. I will just give you a number. If Congress does what he asks in the military, it will go up between \$26 and \$30 billion next year. And if they do what he asks for the domestic appropriated accounts, they will go up between \$5 and \$6 billion between this year and next. So it is pretty obvious to me that whether it is this plan or the plan suggested by the distinguished Senator from Florida, the domestic appropriated accounts have gone up very small, if at all.

Likewise, I am concerned about the domestic appropriated accounts. I

have been concerned on a regular basis, but I would just point up a couple of differences. Since we are talking only about what the good Senator from Florida might offer as a Democrat plan, maybe not even officially theirs but at least the one he has been talking about, let me tell you what happens to the domestic appropriated accounts. If I read the plan right, it goes up a total of 6 percent over 3 years—2, 2, 2. And there are no mandatory caps.

If you look at ours, it goes up over 3 years 10 percent, not 6. And they are mandated. Zero, 5, and 5. So we have some ceilings and some caps in the outyears. I understand the need for flexibility in some of the accounts in the first year. Maybe that is the reason for the 2 percent.

But, so there is no misunderstanding, a reading of the amendment that we offer clearly indicates that as part of this appropriated freeze, the entitlement appropriated accounts are exempt. So we surely do not want to send a message out there that we are freezing food stamps against an entitlement law or that we are freezing SSI, both of which are means tested programs, or that we are freezing AFDC, or that we are freezing any of the programs like that even in the first year. They will get their substantive increase as prescribed by current law. And only those accounts that are truly appropriated and not appropriated entitlements will have the freeze and then the 5 and the 5.

Having said that, I think we will have ample opportunity to discuss that in more detail as to what it really means, but I would argue again that the full appropriated amount is left within the discretion of the appropriators and we use the high side of 1984 as the 1985 freeze. We assume all the supplemental appropriations would be adopted.

Clearly, the Senator makes a point. Those accounts that are heavy in personnel would be those that I would assume the appropriators would look at very carefully and be most willing to provide some increase. And those with very small personnel, maybe major grants with very little personnel, maybe they would cut those a half a point so that you could increase those with heavy personnel.

The total difference is somewhat between \$3 billion and \$4 billion in budget authority more than will be there for the appropriators under the amendment that is before you versus the amendment that the distinguished Senator from Florida might suggest in his approach as to being perhaps more fair.

Now, I want to repeat, there is no effort whatsoever to be misleading, to use a set of figures or baselines that we should not be using. I have clearly

stated to the Senate that we will give them both numbers and both numbers are here. We do not need some outside bureau to tell us that.

If you use the hybrid that the U.S. House has used marking off the President on defense and the remainder from CBO, you get \$144 billion. If you use CBO across the board and not defense at the President's level as used

by the U.S. House, you get the number the Senator has described, \$89 billion.

I do not know which is real. One is assuming steady as you go, using Congressional Budget Office estimates of last year. The other is using what the President said he wanted in defense, which is substantially less than he wanted last year, but nonetheless more than we had provided, and we marked off of it. The House did the

same, I repeat. We have both numbers that we will submit to the Senate as part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so everybody can take a look.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the two deficit reduction estimates appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF CHANGES FROM BASELINE IN FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE

(In billions of dollars)

	Fiscal year—				Total fiscal years 1984-87
	1984	1985	1986	1987	
Revenues:					
Baseline	663.0	733.0	794.9	863.5	
Proposed increases	+2.4	+10.7	+16.1	+19.1	+48.3
Reported resolution	665.4	743.7	811.0	882.6	
Outlays:					
Baseline ¹	855.7	939.7	1,029.9	1,132.5	
National defense		-6.0	-16.0	-18.2	-40.2
Entitlements and other mandatory programs	-0.1	-4.6	-5.6	-9.2	-19.4
Nondefense discretionary programs	-0.1	-3.1	-5.6	-7.1	-15.9
Net interest	-0.1	-1.6	-5.3	-10.8	-17.8
Offsetting receipts		+	-1.0	-1.1	-2.1
Total outlay savings	-0.3	-15.3	-33.5	-46.4	-95.4
Reported resolution	855.3	924.4	996.6	1,086.1	
Deficit:					
Baseline ¹	192.7	206.7	235.0	269.0	
Proposed changes	-2.7	-25.9	-49.6	-55.5	-143.7
(Proposed changes assuming CBO baseline for defense)	(+0.6)	(-16.5)	(-31.5)	(-41.7)	(-89.1)
Reported resolution	189.9	180.7	185.6	203.5	

¹ Assumes CBO baseline for nondefense and President's budget request (not reestimated by CBO) for defense, plus interest adjustment to take account of the defense change. This baseline is consistent with the baseline used by the House Budget Committee in its markup of the First Budget Resolution which was subsequently adopted by the full House of Representatives.

* Less than \$50,000,000.

Note.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would also make two other observations. When we speak of another plan of getting the deficits down rather than leaving them the same in the outyears, or permitting them to rise slightly—and let us say such as the plan proposed by the distinguished Senator from Florida—let everybody know that there really are only two slight differences. He provides 2-percent growth in budget authority in the domestic accounts for the first year and we freeze. He provides \$33 billion more in taxes than was voted in on the floor of the Senate in the tax-raising bill that was before us, and, from what I can tell, reduces defense in budget authority about \$9 billion in the first year over what we have provided.

It is very easy to see the differences. That is how you get what is described in the one case as a significant deficit-reduction plan, and the other one described as something that really will not have any impact. We can go into more detail tomorrow. Before I leave the floor today, I will do my best to insert additional information in the RECORD on the amendment, in the context of the total leadership plan, how it looks, and the assumptions that are used in terms of each of the various

functions of Government, how they might be affected taking into consideration at all times that clearly they are supposed to do that in the appropriation process, as they do with the budget resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that supporting descriptive material and a table appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP PLAN REVENUES

Assumes \$48.3 billion in revenue increase in FY 1984-87 now pending on the Senate floor. The Deficit Reduction Act of 1984, an amendment now being debated, includes provisions related to deferral of certain tax reduction measures, tax-exempt leasing, certain corporate tax provisions, partnership provisions, depreciation and other accounting changes, excise tax, capital gains, changes to the earned income tax credit, and other miscellaneous revenue provisions.

DEFENSE SPENDING

National defense spending would be reduced by \$56.8 billion in budget authority and \$40.2 billion in outlays below the President's request, (or \$7.2 billion in outlays above the CBO baseline for four years). Assumes a real growth in national defense expenditures averaging 5.6 percent annually over the period FY 1985-87 using CBO as-

sumptions. Return defense spending to less than 7.2 percent of GNP, and 30.4 percent of estimated total federal expenditures in FY 1987.

NONDEFENSE SPENDING

Assumes \$37.4 billion in non-defense spending savings over the period FY 1984-87 through a number of provisions as follows:

Assume savings in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1983 (H.R. 4169) adopted by the Senate on April 5 and awaiting the President's signature.

Assume spending savings provisions in S. 2062, the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1983, that were not included in the recently passed House bill (H.R. 4169). This includes veterans provisions, civilian pay raises, military retirement accounting procedures, and small business provisions.

Assume savings in the Agricultural Programs Adjustment Act of 1984 (H.R. 4072) recently passed by both Houses of the Congress and being signed by the President today (April 10).

Assume S. 2522, a bill recently reported by the Senate Banking Committee that would decrease outlays in FY 1985 by increasing the capitalization of the National Credit Union Insurance Fund.

Assume a one-year freeze on all non-defense discretionary programs. For FY 1985 aggregate budget authority for these programs would be set at their present FY 1984 levels. After FY 1985, this aggregate budget authority would be adjusted for inflation as contained in the CBO economic forecast.

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985 AS
REPORTED BY THE SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE

[In billions of dollars]

		Fiscal year—			
		1984	1985	1986	1987
050: National defense	BA	265.3	299.0	333.7	372.0
	O	237.5	266.0	294.6	330.4
150: International affairs	BA	21.0	15.2	16.3	17.1
	O	12.0	13.0	12.2	12.5
250: General science, space, and technology	BA	8.5	8.5	8.6	8.9
	O	8.3	8.4	8.5	8.7
270: Energy	BA	3.0	4.1	4.0	4.0
	O	3.0	3.8	3.9	3.8
300: Natural resources and environment	BA	11.6	11.6	12.0	12.3
	O	12.3	11.7	11.8	11.8
350: Agriculture	BA	4.5	15.6	14.5	13.4
	O	10.4	15.8	14.4	13.2
370: Commerce and housing credit	BA	5.6	6.4	6.3	7.7
	O	4.0	1.6	2.2	3.4
400: Transportation	BA	29.3	28.8	30.0	31.1
	O	25.7	26.9	28.4	29.5
450: Community and regional development	BA	7.2	6.9	7.5	7.8
	O	7.7	8.2	8.0	8.1
500: Education, training, employment, and social services	BA	31.3	28.9	30.2	31.5
	O	28.1	29.0	29.3	30.4
550: Health	BA	31.7	32.4	36.2	39.0
	O	30.8	33.5	35.8	38.5
570: Medical insurance	BA	62.5	71.5	84.2	99.9
	O	59.9	67.1	74.1	83.1
600: Income security	BA	118.4	145.1	154.9	164.4
	O	97.1	113.2	119.0	124.3
650: Social security	BA	175.0	199.8	215.9	229.1
	O	179.4	190.3	202.7	217.1
700: Veterans benefits and services	BA	26.1	26.8	27.0	27.6
	O	25.8	26.2	26.7	27.3
750: Administration of justice	BA	5.9	6.1	6.2	6.3
	O	5.9	6.0	6.2	6.3
800: General government	BA	5.3	5.6	5.8	5.9
	O	5.5	5.4	5.6	5.8
850: General purpose fiscal assistance	BA	6.8	6.4	6.4	6.7
	O	6.8	6.4	6.4	6.7
900: Net interest	BA	109.6	124.9	141.4	160.4
	O	109.6	124.9	141.4	160.4
920: Allowances	BA	7	8	2.0	3.1
	O	7	8	2.1	3.3
950: Undistributed offsetting receipts	BA	-15.2	-33.8	-36.7	-38.5
	O	-15.2	-33.8	-36.7	-38.5
Total	BA	914.1	1,010.6	1,106.4	1,209.7
	O	855.3	924.4	996.6	1,086.1
Revenues		665.4	743.7	811.0	882.6
Deficit		189.9	180.7	185.6	203.5
Public debt		1,596.2	1,843.3	2,105.3	2,394.9

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, having said that, let me suggest there is a major departure from past precedent. The Senator from Florida has properly arrived at it with 3-year gaps, appropriated accounts of zero, 5 and 5 at a total of 10 percent growth. That is different. It is clear that if that was carried out by both bodies and signed by the President, it would have a significant impact. It would be much stronger than the outyear budget resolution recommendations. While it would not be reconciliation, it would be a substantive law of the land to be enforced by a point of order raised by any Senator if and when the cumulative totals prescribed are exceeded either in defense or in the domestic appropriated accounts.

There are many other plans, four or five others that will be offered I hope before we finish. I think it is easy to see the significance of all of them. They are all measured off of the three packages—the taxes, the defense, and the rest of the Government. We break that out into entitlements and nonen-

titlements as we look at some of the plans in that some do far more with entitlements, like social security and medicare and the like, than does this particular approach.

I do not think that anybody has a major reduction package that they can stand up and say dramatically reduces deficits in the future years of 1987 and 1988 unless they have in turn cut substantially defense, raised taxes substantially, or treated the entitlements such as social security and medicare pensions in some very dramatic way such as no increases for another year, or cuts. You just cannot get dramatic deficit reductions without doing that.

My last comment has to do with what deficits are—the real deficits. I hear it said that the hybrid number is yielding deficit reductions that are not real, and nonetheless, as I see it, the deficits that we show are the same whether we use the hybrid line or another, if we actually treat defense that way and the rest of Government the way we have indicated. But there is one thing that is different in addition to the different plans; and, it is what are the real economics that we want to apply. I want the Senate to know that we, in our numbers, have changed nothing from the CBO numbers in terms of economic assumptions, although I will with no reluctance tell the Senate that I think they are wrong. I think the deficits are lower.

I will give you one example. We are using growth in the first quarter of 5.4 percent, and we just received the final on it. It was 8.3. There are some others that are different, including unemployment, and they yield better deficit numbers; that is, less deficit numbers in the outyears. I do not know whose is real. I think as long as we understand what assumptions we are working under, each of us can assume that we are going to pick the one we prefer, and that we think is most right. But there is no fudging of the substantive numbers. Merely, you can pick your set of assumptions, and we will try to give you two at least—the ones we think are most relevant, and then CBO's as prescribed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, out in the real world where people do not know whether deficits are based on the actual baseline or a projected baseline, whether or not we are working with hybrids or something that is normal, where they have never heard of the CBO let alone the dispute between the CBO number and the President's numbers, where they are not sure whether or not these figures are relevant or irrelevant, the reality out in that part of life where most of us have been for the last week or 10 days is that people are scared to death. They know that these deficits threat-

en not only the recovery but, in a much more fundamental sense, the economic future of this country along with many of the things that we have taken for granted almost as the American way of life.

Interest rates are fully 2 points higher than they were this time last year. Unemployment, although it is lower than it has been, shows some signs of again becoming a problem. Many of us feel that inflation is far from dead but, in fact, is only asleep, and probably will come raging back at an early date, maybe as soon as later this year or possibly in 1985.

Mr. President, we have a very, very serious problem. The fact of the matter is that Congress has not dealt very responsibly with it any time since most of us can remember. I do not know how many Keynesians there are in the room, nor how many supply siders, nor how many hardnosed budget balancers, nor how many monetarists. I happen to consider myself in three of the four categories I have just mentioned. It does appear to me that the insights of supply-side economists are, in their main essence, correct; that, if you give people an incentive, they will produce something, and if you cut taxes, it is likely to stimulate investment in productive job-creating activities. That, in essence, I think is the point which the Senator from New Mexico was making when he pointed out that the recovery is very strong; in fact, stronger than was expected.

I also consider myself to be something of a monetarist in that it is clear to me that Milton Friedman and the others who point out the relationship between the growth of the money supply and inflation are on to something. Dr. Friedman, Howard Reich, and a lot of others, who are less renowned but probably equally on target, point out the money supply has been growing very, very rapidly, and that at an early date we may expect this will result in a large increase in the Consumer Price Index for the simple reason that increases in the money supply followed by a brief lag time has evidently always resulted in large increases in inflation.

What has all that to do with the deficit? In the opinion of many of us, there is a direct relationship between the size of the money supply increase and the deficit because the Federal Reserve is accommodating the deficit in establishing the money supply growth.

As for the point of view of hardnosed budget balancers, I guess those counsels have not been taken very seriously in this Chamber, or in the other body, for a good many years because obviously the situation has been growing worse rather steadily.

The interesting thing about all of these economic schools of thought—

that is Keynesians, supply siders, monetarists, and budget balancers—is that they all at least on occasion seem to imply that, if their pet theory were put into effect, suddenly everything would be predictably very good for the economy; that, if only according to one school of thought or another we were to adopt certain measures, the economy would stabilize and begin to grow, unemployment would go down, prices would level off, and we would have a growing, thriving, prospering United States.

In that respect most of the schools of economic theory agree, and with that I respectfully disagree. Even if we did absolutely everything right in this body, even if we adopted the economic policies which were best calculated to enhance the prosperity of the future of this country, we have to face the fact that what happens in the American economy is very, very heavily impacted by developments over which we have no control whatsoever. That is to say things that happen beyond our borders: wars, rumors of wars, threats of wars, changes in oil prices, the possible collapse of foreign countries or foreign banks, favorable or unfavorable balance of trade and payments. All of these have an economic impact on the future of this country and really are beyond the control of anything that the Congress may do.

Having said that, however, and having made it clear that I do not think we have totally under control to any finite degree the economic future of this country, it is hard for me to imagine how the Congress of the United States could have behaved with greater irresponsibility over the last 4 or 5 years than in fact we have behaved. I do not say this in any partisan sense because it appears to me that both parties bear a heavy degree of responsibility for the course we have followed, a course which has resulted in colossal expenditures, very rapid increases in the rate at which money is being spent, and deficits of a magnitude which were just undreamed of a very few years ago.

I am not going to quibble with the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Florida, or anybody else about how big the deficits are going to be in the future. But one thing we do know is the deficit this year is going to be around \$200 billion. Some people think it is going to be \$200 billion the next year and the year after that and every year in the future as far as the eye can see. Some, in fact, estimate that the gap between revenues and expenditures is growing wider, that the deficits will grow larger, and that by the end of the decade, if we do nothing, they will probably be bigger than they are today. Others, as the Senator from New Mexico, have pointed out that maybe the gap is beginning to narrow and at some point in the

future if we do nothing the deficit will get smaller. I am not sure that is true.

In any case, the assumption that we can go on as we are and let things play out over 4 or 5 years without suffering some kind of collapse, without inviting economic stagnation, without suffering a very large increase in inflation, the interest rate and unemployment, without, in fact, bringing our whole economy down around our ears, I think is absolutely tempting fate. To make such an assumption, to behave in this Chamber as if we can let these deficits occur, I think is playing Russian roulette or something worse with our national economy.

So, Mr. President, it is clear to me, and I think it is increasingly clear to a majority in this Chamber as it is to thoughtful men and women around the country, that the moment is here when we have to lay aside political considerations, when we have to be willing to take some chances in order to get spending and revenues balanced up.

I think for many of us it is even time when we have to be willing to say that there just are not any more sacred cows in this process. For someone like me who thinks it is important that we maintain a high level of national defense, it is time for us to make some cuts in the defense budget. I say that very reluctantly, because I am convinced that the peace of the world depends in large measure upon the defense preparedness of this country. But there is also some point when the threat to our economy grows so serious that it also becomes a national security threat, and I think we have reached that point and beyond. Therefore, I am ready to make some cuts in the defense spending pattern that I was never ready to make before.

There are many of us who think that these large deficits are blamed properly and totally on a runup in spending which is just without reason; that we are not undertaxed but, in fact, overspent. That is my belief. At the right time I will be prepared to speak to that at some length. I personally think we can balance the budget entirely by relying on spending restraints, by cutting back the rate of increase in most or all Government programs, and actually making reductions in the year-to-year spending pattern in some.

I do not think we need a tax increase, and yet I am convinced that the situation has grown so serious, that we are so close to the edge of economic disaster in this country, that I am not going to let tax policy be a sacred cow either. For that reason, I voted in committee and again on the floor with the majority to adopt a package of what were termed, I guess, loophole closings and revenue enhancements but which, in fact, by their proper name, are an increase in

taxes. I did not want to do that. For the same reason that I am ready to entertain cuts in defense, I am ready to entertain increases in the revenue base.

I hope all Senators will approach the question which is now before us with the same kind of willingness to sacrifice pet ideas and pet projects and pet theories that I have just described, because I really think the situation that is before us is very serious. This may be one of the very last clear chances we have to solve this problem.

We have an election coming up and I do not know how often we are going to come back to this issue between now and election. But I sense that in the next month or 6 weeks, in the debate on this bill, on the budget resolution and on the debt limit increase which will be coming presently, we are going to make all the decisions we are going to make that will have a chance to affect the national and international economy during this year.

So it is now or never, or at least now or maybe not until early 1985. Between now and 1985 a lot can happen and my guess is that if we in a timed or pusillanimous way we will be back here a year from now with the economy literally coming down around our ears.

Mr. President, the notion which is contained in the measure which is recommended to us today by the Budget Committee which comes to the floor by a narrow margin of just one vote in the Budget Committee, and I was part of the majority that voted to recommend this measure even though I did not think it was the best approach, is the so-called downpayment plan. The essence of that plan is to say we have a huge problem. We have \$600 or \$700 billion in deficits facing us in the eye over the next 3 years and, therefore, we ought to get a start on it, we ought to make a downpayment on the problem and then come back after the election when presumably we will all be much more courageous and statesmanlike. That is, I think, an appealing idea, at least at the superficial level. The idea of making a downpayment sounds prudent.

It has the ring of what reasonable men and women will do. It says in effect we are going to approach this problem gradually, we are not going to do anything drastic, we are not going to be rash, we are not going to be precipitous. We are going to make a downpayment, such as a downpayment on a house, a step by step, methodical process.

Alas, my friends, it is not so. The downpayment in this case is not the kind of downpayment that will make the problem easier to solve at a later date but is likely to make it worse, because the downpayment is not as large as the ground we are going to lose be-

tween now and the time we will ever get back to this matter, say a year from now.

Maybe this downpayment is the best we can get. If it is, then I am going to vote for it again as I did in committee. But I am certainly hoping that the Senator from Florida, the Senator from New Mexico, or somebody is going to present some suggestion which will do more than just make a downpayment on this problem.

To give you some idea of what we are talking about—and I do not intend to quibble over whether this is \$100 billion, \$88 billion, \$144 billion, depending upon whether you are using a relevant baseline, a CBO baseline, the President's baseline, or somebody else's baseline—whether we are talking about a \$100 billion or a \$150 billion deficit reduction is really not the point when you see the magnitude of the problem.

It should be measured against deficits of at least \$600 to \$700 billion over the next 3 years and total outlays in excess of \$3 trillion.

Mr. President, to agonize under such circumstances over a so-called downpayment of that size, as if this were the maximum, as if it were in the words of one Senator the best we are ever going to be able to do, really confides how weak we are, how indecisive we are. In my opinion, it does not portray strength of purpose but, in fact, weakness of political courage.

There is a second thing about this downpayment idea that troubles me. That is the fact that it is very heavily backloaded.

Much of the debate over budget and tax issues in this Chamber finally turn on how we think our policy will be received by the country, particularly by those elements of the country which are influential in setting interest rates and making economic decisions on which, in turn, depend the economic vitality of our communities and the opportunities for working men and women to have jobs.

Specifically, it is often raised as an issue in this Chamber that such-and-such a proposal will or will not be favorably received by Wall Street—meaning not just that geographic part of New York City, but investors, those who have money to commit, the idea being that if we can convince them that we are serious about the deficit-reduction idea, they will then be willing to commit loan and equity funds at rates of return which are lower, knowing that if the deficits are lower, interest rates are likely to decline. But if they fear that the deficit-reduction package is not real or not certain enough or not proportionate to the nature of the problem, the justifiable fear that is often expressed in this Chamber is that investors will turn to ever shorter-term instruments, that they will demand ever higher rates of

return, and that interest rates will be bid up; and as interest rates go up, the housing industry shuts down, the automobile industry shuts down, people are thrown out of work, the recovery stalls out and is finally smothered.

That is exactly what is happening right now, as I pointed out a moment ago. Interest rates are about 2 percentage points above what they were just 1 year ago. We are right at the point where the credibility of this package becomes crucial on Wall Street and on Main Street, with people who are making the investment and business decisions on which employment and prosperity depend.

What has that to do with the fact that the plan is heavily backloaded, as I described it? Very simple. Most of the savings in this downpayment plan are projected to occur not now, but after the election, next year and in the year after. My friends, people out in the country—economists, the heads of companies, the heads of large labor organizations, investors, security analysts—are not fools. They know that we are not really biting the bullet. They know that we are only making token reductions, even in the downpayment plan, in the current year; that most of the real savings are projected to occur in the future and that Congress may well, based on past history, not fulfill its undertakings in this measure; that the savings that we are projecting may not occur.

This brings me to the reason I wanted to arise at this moment, because what credibility there is in this plan—and I must say that I think it is limited, although I shall vote for it if it is the best we can get, after I have had a chance to vote for something else—rests upon the assumption that these caps on the appropriated accounts will, in fact, be binding; that they will be observed by Congress.

We all know that Congress can subsequently enact a new statute and thereby override the caps. We all recall that our dear friend and former colleague, Senator Byrd of Virginia, proposed and Congress adopted the so-called Byrd amendment, which required by law—it was a statute, not sense of the Senate, not a resolution, but a statutory enactment—that the budget would be balanced on and after such-and-such a date. But of course, every subsequent statutory enactment is to say, every appropriation bill—superseded the Byrd amendment.

How is the pending proposal different from that? In a very significant way. Even though I think it is flawed, it is significantly different from the old Byrd amendment.

The difference is that the spending caps make proposed appropriations bills and amendments subject to a point of order on this floor—not by functional subtotals, but in a very sig-

nificant way, by subtotals based on defense and nondefense.

In other words, if you bring a defense appropriation to the floor that violates the cap, somebody can stand up and say, "I make a point of order." To my friends on the floor and those who may be listening in their offices, I say here is the point which I wish them to consider: What happens when the Chair rules that a particular appropriation violates the cap? That is, what happens when the Chair sustains the point of order? The answer is, according to the bill in its present form, that a waiver is permitted upon a vote of a majority of the quorum. In other words, 26 Senators could waive this allegedly ironclad guarantee that the second and third year savings in this backloaded downpayment plan will occur.

I do not think this is a very good plan to begin with. It is not big enough; backloading does not make sense. We ought to do better, if we were dead serious about it, facing \$3 trillion in spending and \$50 to \$60 billion in deficit by anybody's estimate, if we are really serious, we ought to do better than \$100 or \$200 billion.

But if we are going to go ahead with this, surely we should make provision that the pending cap, on which this whole thing really hinges, will have a lot more solid foundation than something which can be waived by a vote of a majority of the quorum.

This came to my attention when I discussed the procedure under which such points of order would be entertained with the Parliamentarian of the Senate. I put this question to him: If a point of order is raised and sustained by the Chair, would it then be in order to appeal? Of course, he pointed out to me that it would be.

I then asked, would the point of order appeal be debatable? Here is another important distinction that I ask Senators to think about in preparation for the debate and amendment which is to follow: Under the Budget Act, the appeal on a point of order is only debatable for 1 hour. But if we enact a separate statutory provision as is proposed in this measure, it will be subject to unlimited debate. Therefore, if a point of order were sustained and appealed, a filibuster could ensue on the appeal and thereby, we could really be sure that, unless 60 Senators were prepared to vote to cut off a filibuster a point of order could be sustained, but it would be impractical.

Ah, but there is a loophole. The loophole is the waiver provision, which says that you can filibuster the appeal so there would never be an appeal. What there would be instead is a motion for a waiver, which could be passed on a simple majority vote.

Mr. President, I have not quite worked out how we ought to correct

this, but it is apparent to me that if it is serious, if this is a plan that we are serious about, we should be prepared to make these spending caps on appropriations accounts more meaningful than that. I suppose that at the right moment, I shall offer an amendment which will either delete the waiver provision or in some way put the lid on this thing so we shall really know whether we are voting on something that is likely to have its intended effect. I should like to consult with other Senators after they have had a chance to consider this matter as to the exact form of the amendment, but something along these lines seems well advised.

The Senator from New Mexico made the point that we are not freezing everything in this legislation. He is absolutely right. We are not freezing the entitlement programs which many, including the Senator from Colorado, think is where we have to begin to make some progress if we are really going to solve this budget dilemma we face. We are not doing that here.

We are not really freezing defense. In fact, we are allowing fairly substantial increases in defense; increases I must say I would be glad to support if we were not in such a horrible budget crunch right now, because I think, by and large, our defense has been underfunded for a number of years. But these increases in the type of budgetary crisis, in the kind of economic dilemma we are facing, seem to me to be fairly generous and, in fact, perhaps as part of a package, I would vote to scale back that rate of increase. I would not like to vote for that just as an isolated instance, but if I got something across the board that was an improvement, I might do so. But we are not doing that in this proposal.

The whole essence, the whole—well, the beef, if I may use that colloquial term, because somebody is going to ask presently, where is the beef?—the beef in this proposal is the cap on the appropriations accounts, and I must tell my colleagues that the cap is not screwed on there tight enough to be really meaningful. Before we bring this amendment to a vote, I believe it should be repaired, at least to the extent of assuring that, once enacted, the cap could not be waived by vote of a majority of the quorum.

Mr. President, I am not going to say more at this time. As this debate progresses, I may have some more thoughts to share with my colleagues, and I no doubt will have, unless someone else comes up with something better, an amendment to remedy this obvious and glaring weakness in the plan as I understand it to have been presented.

But before I yield the floor, I close by saying a word of appreciation to the chairman of the Budget Committee, my colleague from New Mexico

(Mr. DOMENICI). I have not spoken in glowingly complimentary terms about the proposal which he has brought to the floor. And yet I want to make it very clear that I not only do not intend any criticism of him but in fact I want to acknowledge him for what I believe him to be, and that is the most skillful legislator on this floor. Recently a national magazine rated him as the chairman most likely to get his legislation passed. That would have been impressive coming from any national publication but it was particularly interesting and instructive because as I understand it he was evaluated in this magazine not on the basis of editorial judgment of the writers or editors but as a result of a survey of Members of the U.S. Senate who said that the Senator from New Mexico had that kind of skill, and I agree with that.

I think getting that ball advanced as far as he has, even though I think it is not very far, but getting it this far down the field and getting us focused in the way he has and gaining the agreement of the President of the United States and others that we have got to have a deficit reduction package I think is a remarkable achievement. And even though I would like to see a bigger deficit reduction, that does not in any sense mitigate the fact that by getting us to this point he has made possible either some progress or a great deal of progress, depending upon how we handle it from this point forward.

I salute him, and I congratulate him for having really a wonderful success, and I know that it has come, because I have been at his side off and on during these last few months, as a result of great personal effort and study and scholarship and devotion on his part. I think that when the final chapter of this budgetary story is finally written, all Senators will feel as I do—we owe him a great debt of gratitude for his leadership on this matter.

Having said that, I still think we ought to go further, I think we ought to have more than what he has been able to give us so far, and I am going to predict that while he may feel obligated to support the rose garden budget or the leadership budget, as it has been called, if we are able to achieve greater savings, there will be little real complaint from our friend from New Mexico. And so I say let us get some bigger cuts and roll right over the top of them, and I bet he will be the first to support it when we go to battle.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. I first would like to say, so I will not forget this, if there are any Senators who would like to be

heard this afternoon, to make some particular points with reference to the deficit or what we are proposing, I do not think we are going to be here very long and I hope, if they are listening, they would understand if they want to comment we are still here, but we may not be 15 or 20 minutes from now.

Before the distinguished Senator from Colorado leaves, let me say to him, having sat and listened to his qualified support, I am glad he is not a total opponent. I do not know what I would be able to do with this proposal if he were. It is no wonder that that same national periodical, based upon the judgment of his peers, indicated that he is one of the best orators in the Senate, I compliment him for that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That was a misprint.

Mr. DOMENICI. Again, I am very sorry that he so frequently has to orate with reference to our budget deficit and our plan. But that is good for us all. I thank the Senator for his kindness and the way he handled things today.

Let me make an observation with reference to the cap. The Senator makes a point. I would also suggest that you do things in steps around here. We are producing appropriation out year caps historic in nature. We never had anything like it before. The Senator from Colorado would like it even stronger, but I submit that when you can put enforceable caps in an out year appropriation bill where when they reach a certain level of cumulative budget authority can be out of order on its face and everyone will know about it, the institution will know about it, the people will know about it—you have a clearly defined operational rule for the first time in history requiring an affirmative vote on that issue, if you want to, to waive it—I submit is clearly a giant step in the direction of fiscal responsibility and a far cry from previous efforts to set limits on Federal Government expenditures. I believe that while we can work together to make it even stronger, I am not sure the Senate wants to go with an inordinate majority on a waiver, I am not sure they would want to go with eliminating the waiver provisions but clearly I am willing to work with the Senator from Colorado and others on it. And the Senate should know I did not design the language all by myself. There are a number of people involved in this as there are in most steps forward in this democratic process and especially in this institution. So we will look at that later on.

However, the Senate should know, and those who are interested in what this cap means, how enforceable is it, that no one can devise a process that is totally without the possibility that the Senate and/or the House in a

future act will change it. Let me even suggest what is almost a cardinal sin; that if we were to vote in a freeze on everything here today, before this year is out it could end up less than a freeze by significant amounts. Let me suggest that when we did our TEFRA and the other changes that people have now said where did the three for one go—it was supposed to be \$3 in cuts for \$1 in taxes. I am not sure that it came out three for one but I will tell you what I am sure of. I am sure that before the year was out, the same people who had agreed to that process, including the White House, had sent down to us requests for new money.

Mr. CHILES. When the Senator points around to people that agreed to that, please do not point to this side; we did not get included in that agreement.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will talk about this side, but indeed on the add ons that I am not mentioning many people on both sides voted for it. For instance, after you put the freeze on we added \$6 billion in budget authority for the farm program. I do not know very many people who did not vote for that. It was kind of overwhelming. Well, that was after you had already agreed on the year what it was all about and what you were going to do and what the appropriations were going to look like. That was \$5½ billion.

In addition, we passed in the lame duck session a whole new gasoline tax proposal and highway trust fund and we let them spend an extra billion dollars over what we had planned before. Lo and behold, after the deal was made, we settled the social security problem for our country, and in settling we had to spend between \$8 and \$10 billion—perhaps the Senator from Colorado can correct me—out of general fund money into the social security fund for the first year's total package in an effort to make it secure.

Now, I do not care to get involved in a debate as to whether we did or not. I am merely telling you what can happen. Now, likewise, there is one other. We had unemployment and we had a compensation law. It ran out of money, or was beginning to in certain States, and after we finished we passed it and I am not familiar with the dollars at this point, but it was substantial.

Now, I only tell you this because I believe those would have occurred had we agreed on a mandatory freeze. And along came a CCC requirement, an entitlement for farmers and ranchers, and it was going broke and they needed to get the agreed-upon payments, which we passed.

Nonetheless, I do accept the ideas of the Senator from Colorado, that perhaps we should look from time to time to very, very stringent, out-year binding mechanisms.

I repeat that I am not at all adverse to working with the Senator with reference to that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I very much appreciate the willingness of the Senator from New Mexico to consider something along those lines.

I want to make it clear that I am not trying to lock the Senate into anything it does not want to get locked into. My suggestion, and it is subject to refinement, was merely to give the proposed rule in this bill—this is, the rule that says no appropriation above the specified cap—the same status as any other rule of the Senate. Other rules of the Senate, with the exception of the Budget Act, cannot be waived by majority vote.

In other words, if the rules of the Senate are being violated and a point of order is raised and the Chair hands down a ruling sustaining the point of order, then somebody cannot stand up and say: "I move that we waive that rule and that it be done by majority vote." The only way we can do it, in that circumstance, is to appeal the ruling of the Chair, and that motion is fully debatable.

So, any time you get into that situation, you have inherently the right of Senators to debate at length and even to filibuster. Protecting the rules—and now we are talking about the integrity of the process—is something which is subject to filibuster and, in my opinion, should be, recognizing that, in the final analysis, 60 Senators can cut off the debate.

If we are serious about this, we should not give it less status than other rules of the Senate.

Mr. DOMENICI. I repeat that we will work on it with other interested Senators. I merely suggest that you break ground with new and difficult areas a step at a time. This is a giant step. The Senator has raised some very interesting and perhaps valid distinctions. I suggest, nonetheless, that this is different from anything else, since neither institution has done this before, in all its history. It is a pretty giant step to build in these caps.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the

Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF CERTAIN SENATORS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, following the time for the two leaders under the standing order tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent that there be special orders, not to exceed 15 minutes each, for the following Senators: Senator PROXMIRE, Senator KASSEBAUM, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator BAUCUS, and Senator BIDEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following those special orders tomorrow, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend beyond 2 p.m., with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that following routine morning business on tomorrow, at 2 p.m. the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2163, the Federal Boat Safety Act, with amendment 3027 being the pending business. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I say to my good friend from West Virginia that I have missed him these last 8 days.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the feeling is mutual. I have missed my good friend, the assistant Republican leader, as well.

THE EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. STEVENS. I ask the Senator if he is willing to consent to the Senate going into executive session to consider nominations on the calendar beginning with No. 514, through Calendar No. 556.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this side of the aisle is ready to proceed with the nominations delineated by the distinguished assistant Republican leader, with the exception of Calendar Order No. 514.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the distinguished Democratic leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session for the purpose of considering Calendar Nos. 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, and 556, and a request I

will make to remove the injunction of secrecy from seven treaties.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc and confirmed en bloc.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

THE JUDICIARY

Edward Leavy, of Oregon, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Oregon.

William D. Browning, of Arizona, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Arizona.

Joseph J. Longobardi, of Delaware, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Delaware.

Terrence W. Boyle, of North Carolina, to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Daniel Raul Lopez, of California to be a Commissioner of the U.S. Parole Commission for a term of six years.

COPYRIGHT ROYALTY TRIBUNAL

Mario F. Aguero, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Copyright Royalty Tribunal for the unexpired term of seven years from September 27, 1977.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the nominations were confirmed.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from seven treaties transmitted to the Senate by the President during the adjournment of the Senate:

Extradition Treaty with Thailand (Treaty Doc. No. 98-16) received on April 13, 1984;

Extradition Treaty with Costa Rica (Treaty Doc. No. 98-17) and an Extradition Treaty with Jamaica (Treaty Doc. No. 98-18) received on April 17, 1984;

Extradition Treaty with Ireland (Treaty Doc. No. 98-19); Extradition Treaty with Italy (Treaty Doc. No. 98-20) and a tax protocol with France (Treaty Doc. No. 98-21) received on April 18, 1984; and

A second tax protocol with Canada (Treaty Doc. No. 98-22) received on April 19, 1984.

I ask that these treaties be considered as having been read the first time; that they be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's letters of transmittal be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The messages of the President are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty on Extradition between the United States of America and Thailand, signed at Washington on December 14, 1983.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

The Treaty will facilitate United States efforts to prosecute narcotics conspiracies by expressly providing that conspiracies and attempts to commit extraditable offenses constitute extraditable offenses.

The Treaty follows generally the form and content of extradition treaties recently concluded by this Government.

Upon entry into force, it will terminate and supersede the existing Extradition Treaty between the United States and Thailand.

This Treaty will make a significant contribution to international cooperation in law enforcement. I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Treaty and give its advice and consent to ratification.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 13, 1984.

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty on Extradition between the United States of America and Costa Rica, signed at San Jose on December 4, 1982, together with a related exchange of notes signed on December 16, 1982.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the Report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

The Treaty will facilitate United States efforts to prosecute narcotics conspiracies by expressly providing that conspiracies and attempts to commit extraditable offenses constitute extraditable offenses. The Treaty also provides a legal basis for temporarily surrendering prisoners to stand trial for crimes which occurred in the requesting State.

The Treaty follows generally the form and content of extradition treaties recently concluded by this Government. Upon entry into force, it will

terminate and supersede the existing extradition treaty between the United States and Costa Rica.

This Treaty will make a significant contribution to international cooperation in law enforcement. I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Treaty and give its advice and consent to ratification.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 17, 1984.

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty on Extradition between the United States of America and Jamaica, signed at Kingston on June 14, 1983.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

The Treaty is the first modern United States extradition treaty within the Caribbean region. The Treaty will facilitate United States efforts to prosecute narcotics conspiracies by expressly providing that conspiracies and attempts to commit extraditable offenses constitute extraditable offenses.

The Treaty follows generally the form and content of extradition treaties recently concluded by this Government. Upon entry into force of this Treaty, the Extradition Treaty between the United States and the United Kingdom signed on December 22, 1931, shall cease to have effect between the United States and Jamaica.

This Treaty will make a significant contribution to international cooperation in law enforcement. I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Treaty and give its advice and consent to ratification.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 17, 1984.

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty on Extradition between the United States of America and Ireland, signed at Washington on July 13, 1983.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the Report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

The Treaty is the first law enforcement treaty directly negotiated between the United States and Ireland. It fills a gap resulting from a 1965 change in Irish law which precludes the implementation of any applicable extradition agreements between the United States and Great Britain. The Treaty follows generally the form and content of extradition treaties recently concluded by this Government.

This Treaty will make a significant contribution to international cooperation in law enforcement. I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Treaty and give its advice and consent to ratification.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 18, 1984.

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty on Extradition between the United States of America and Italy, signed at Rome on October 13, 1983.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the Report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

The Treaty will facilitate United States efforts to prosecute narcotics conspiracies by expressly providing that conspiracies and attempts to commit extraditable offenses constitute extraditable offenses. The Treaty also provides a legal basis for temporarily surrendering prisoners to stand trial for crimes which occurred in the requesting State.

The Treaty follows generally the form and content of extradition treaties recently concluded by this Government. Upon entry into force, it will terminate and supersede the existing extradition treaty between the United States and Italy.

This Treaty will make a significant contribution to international cooperation in law enforcement. I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Treaty and give its advice and consent to ratification.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 18, 1984.

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith for Senate advice and consent to ratification a Protocol to the Convention between the United States of America and the French Republic with respect to taxes on income and property of July 28, 1967, as amended by the Protocols of October 12, 1970, and November 24, 1978. The present Protocol was signed at Paris on January 17, 1984. I also transmit the report of the Department of State on the Protocol.

The principal reason for further amending the Convention is the recently enacted French wealth tax which could adversely affect Americans living in France. The Protocol exempts from this tax foreign assets owned by United States citizens temporarily resident in France. The Protocol also provides an exemption from tax at source on interest, and it includes rules for limiting the benefits of the Convention to residents of the United States or France.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Protocol and give advice and consent to its ratification.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 18, 1984.

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for Senate advice and consent to ratification, a Second Protocol, signed at Washington on March 28, 1984, Amending the Convention between the United States and Canada with Respect to Taxes on Income and on Capital, signed at Washington on September 26, 1980, as amended by a Protocol signed at Ottawa on June 14, 1983. I also transmit the report of the Department of State with respect to the second protocol.

The Social Security Amendments of 1983 were enacted since the negotiation of the convention and first protocol. They provide in part that social security benefits paid to nonresident aliens henceforth will be subject to an effective 15 percent withholding tax. The Canadian Government has requested that the pending convention be amended to exempt Canadian residents from such withholding.

The second protocol would amend Article XVIII (Pensions and Annuities) of the convention, so as to provide that social security benefits paid by one party to residents of the other "shall be taxable only in that other State." However, United States citizens resident in Canada will continue to be taxable to the extent provided under United States law.

It is most desirable that this second protocol, together with the convention and first protocol, be considered by the Senate as soon as possible and that the Senate give advice and consent to ratification of the convention and two amending protocols.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 18, 1984.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask my good friend from West Virginia if he knows of anything further to come before the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, my good friend, the Republican acting leader, is thoughtful and considerate. I have nothing in mind.

I thank the Senator, and I have nothing further.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator very much.

RECESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, at 4 p.m., recessed until Wednesday, April 25, 1984, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Secretary of the Senate April 13, 1984, under authority of the order of the Senate of April 13, 1984:

THE JUDICIARY

Joel Gerber, of Virginia, to be a judge of the United States Tax Court for a term expiring fifteen years after he takes office, vice C. Moxley Featherston, retired.

Executive nominations received by the Secretary of the Senate April 18, 1984, under authority of the order of the Senate of April 13, 1984:

THE JUDICIARY

Lloyd D. George, of Nevada, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Nevada vice Roger D. Foley, retired.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be reassigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be Lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. James A. Abrahamson, XXX-X...
X., U.S. Air Force.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be Lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. William I. Rolya, XXX-XX-XXXX,
age 56, U.S. Army.

Executive nominations received by the Secretary of the Senate April 19, 1984, under authority of the order of the Senate of April 13, 1984:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

S. L. Abbott, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Lesotho.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

James Paul Wade, Jr., of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense (new position—Public Law 98-94, of September 24, 1983).

Everett Pyatt, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, vice George A. Sawyer, resigned.

UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES

Ann S. Peterson, of Illinois, to be a member of the Board of Regents of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences for a term expiring June 20, 1989, vice Robert Higgins Ebert, term expired.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Virgil E. Brown, of Ohio, to be a member of the Advisory Board of the Saint Law-

rence Seaway Development Corp., vice Foster S. Brown, resigned.

John R. Wall, of Ohio, to be a member of the Advisory Board of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corp., vice Joseph N. Thomas.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

William W. Hoover, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Defense Programs), vice Herman E. Roser, resigned.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The following-named persons to be members of the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs for terms expiring May 8, 1986:

Naomi Brummond, of Nebraska, vice Mary Jo Arndt, term expired.

Peter Douglas Keisler, of Connecticut, vice Virginia Gillham Tinsley, term expired.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Jacqueline E. Schafer, of New York to be a member of the Council on Environmental Quality, vice Nancy A. Maloley, resigned.

Bernadine Healy Bulkley, of Maryland, to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (new position).

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Clyde A. Bragdon, Jr., of California, to be Administrator of the U.S. Fire Administration, vice Bobby Jack Thompson, resigned.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

The following-named persons to be members of the National Council on the Humanities for terms expiring January 26, 1990:

William Barclay Allen, of California, vice Charles V. Hamilton, term expired.

Mary Josephine Conrad Cresimore, of North Carolina, vice Louis J. Hector, term expired.

Leon Richard Kass, of Illinois, vice M. Carl Holman, term expired.

Kathleen S. Kilpatrick, of Connecticut, vice Harriet Morse Zimmerman, term expired.

James V. Schall, of California, vice Leon Stein, term expired.

Helen Marie Taylor, of Virginia, vice Mary Beth Norton, term expired.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Victor M. Rivera, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development, vice Otto J. Reich, resigned.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following person for appointment as Reserve of the Air Force, in the grade indicated under the provisions of sections 593 and 8371, title 10, United States Code.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be colonel

Rice, David F., xxx-xx-xxxx

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for permanent promotion in the U.S. Army in accordance with the appropriate provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 624:

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Burns, Pamela K., xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Whitaker, Stephen D., xxx-xx-xxxx

ARMY

To be major

Guthmiller, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Martin, Lavelle, xxx-xx-xxxx
Nance, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ward, Edward P., xxx-xx-xxxx

CHAPLAIN

To be major

Brown, Nicholas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Walter, Larry A., xxx-xx-xxxx

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be major

Picariello, Jeanne M., xxx-xx-xxxx

DENTAL CORPS

To be major

Smith, Terrence M., xxx-xx-xxxx

IN THE ARMY

The following-named cadets, graduating class of 1984, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 531 and 4353, title 10, United States Code:

Aarthun, Troy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Abeyta, Anycia A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Accardi, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Aceves, Patricia, xxx-xx-xxxx
Adams, Glen P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Adams, John A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Adams, Matthew H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ahrens, Stephen F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Alzer, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Alberga, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Alibrandi, Philip L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Allem, Bryan K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Allen, Andrea L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Allgrove, Donald C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Alonso, Vincent E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Alsberry, Dennis M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Alto, Brian L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Alvarez, Joseph H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ammon, Joseph C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Amundsen, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anderson, Derric H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Andrews, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Angresano, Paul M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Antoniou, Christos T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Arbaugh, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ariall, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Armstrong, Bryan J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Arnberg, Andrew B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Arterburn, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Asimos, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Aten, Herbert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Auge, David D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Auman, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Auyeung, Peter Y., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ayres, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Baca, J. Steven, xxx-xx-xxxx
Baird, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Baker, Keith A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Baldi, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Baldwin, Cleophas, xxx-xx-xxxx
Balland, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bandy, Vincent A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Baragona, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barker, Clayton L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barnett, Gil W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barrette, Dana P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bastin, Gary P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bates, Nancy E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bayer, Craig S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bazemore, Jeffrey T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beach, Daniel A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beach, Dwight E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Beach, Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beals, Paul M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beaty, Tommy D., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Beben, Christopher J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Becker, Bradley B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beckwith, Frank R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bednar, Raymond P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Belcher, Eric R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bellisle, Monica M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Belsky, George P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bentley, Douglas L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bentley, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Berenyi, Gary F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bergner, Jeffrey J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bermudez, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bertocci, Jeffrey D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Besch, Eric C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bibbo, Anthony, xxx-xx-xxxx
Biever, Jacob D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Billman, Craig D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Birman, Diane K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bishop, Christy M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Black, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Blas, Benny A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Blyth, Matthew E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bobinski, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bogan, James M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Bohn, Craig E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boling, Anthony J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bolyard, Kevin G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bond, Claud R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boone, Donald L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Borsodi, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bouckley, Andy F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boyd, Daniel O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boylan, Peter J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Brach, Randy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bradley, Allen S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bradley, Sherry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brazier, Jonathan S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Breuhan, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brimmer, Douglas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brockson, Brian M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brooks, Alfred L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Broski, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brower, Christopher M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Christopher P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, James G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Jay P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Kenneth, xxx-xx-xxxx
Browning, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bruno, Bruce E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Buchs, Todd A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Buckheit, John, xxx-xx-xxxx
Buckingham, Patricia A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Buehler, Alexander T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burke, Thomas B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burner, Larry C., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Burwell, Mark W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Butler, Aaron G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Buzzell, John M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Bynum, Markus S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cabacungan, Guillermo R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cabot, Lawrence P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cadena, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cahill, Dennis J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cain, Judith B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Calbos, Philip T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Callahan, Sean M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Callin, Jeffrey M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Calverase, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Campbell, Kelly N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cannella, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cantwell, Gregory L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Caracello, Dominic J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Caraccio, Daniel J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carl, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx
Carlin, Christopher, xxx-xx-xxxx
Carney, Robert E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carpenter, Lonny J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carrington, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carroll, Barry G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carroll, Larry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carvelli, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cattley, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Celestan, Gregory J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Celeste, Ronald C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cepak, Charlie J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ceremuga, George J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cerniglia, Marc E., xxx-xx-xxxx

Cersovsky, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chandler, Stacey C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chang, Dean I., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chapman, Edwin R., II., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chapman, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Char, Chester A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Childers, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chrisman, Louise A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Christensen, Jonathon L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Christensen, Matthew M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Christmas, Joey L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chu, Joseph, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chung, Tony C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Church, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clark, Frank S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clark, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clark, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clark, Patrick J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clarke, Richard D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cleaves, Jon S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clements, Irina C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clifford, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cluff, Leila, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cobb, Alma J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coddington, Nicholas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coester, Daniel W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Conklin, Willard D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cook, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cook, Edwin C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cook, Gregory W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cook, Mark C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cooper, Troy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cornett, Charles K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cosby, William N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cotter, Craig S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cottone, Daniel J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coyle, Bernard M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coyle, William F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cozart, Curtis W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cozza, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Craig, Robert J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crane, Mark V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Criss, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cronin, Joshua J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crook, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crosby, Jerry L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cuerington, Andre M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cullen, Kenneth P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Curry, Peter J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cyr, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Danielsen, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Darrow, Keith R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dasalla, Randy R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dascher, Dag P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davidson, Troy E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davie, Gerald S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davison, Bruce H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Deal, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Deantona, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 DeBenedictis, Susan D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Delawter, Diane L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Delphin, Julie A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Deluca, Ralph C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Demaio, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Demarco, Joseph F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Demario, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Demont, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dequattro, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Detwiler, Steven B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Devens, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Devney, Steven C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dewitt, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dick, Bradley C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dickinson, Reuben D., IV, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dickinson, Douglas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dobson, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dodgson, Sean K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Doerries, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dolt, Christopher C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Donahue, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Doner, Karen E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Donovan, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dougherty, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dougherty, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dow, Thurman E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dowd, Dennis J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dowd, John F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Doyle, Peter T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Drennan, Martha J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Driscoll, Stephen J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dubois, Richard D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dudley, Raymond L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duff, Michael, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duffy, Thomas R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duguay, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dunaway, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dunne, Maurice F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Durant, Darrell D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dyekman, Gregory J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dyson, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Earl, Arthur J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eckelbarger, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eckersley, Alan D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Edelen, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Edleson, Brenda A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Edwards, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Edwards, Scott A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Elghmy, Brian S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eisiminger, Thomas L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Elliott, Kent M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Elliott, Stefan, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Enloe, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Enriquez, Oswald, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Epling, Stephen B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Erickson, Jeffrey M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eucker, Darrell L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ewing, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Faddis, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fallon, Willard G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fancher, Daniel M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Faria, Ross J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Faris, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Farrell, Joseph T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Faucett, Joseph R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fechter, Herbert P., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fehl, Emery B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ferguson, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ferro, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ferry, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fessenden, Alan D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fetterman, Patrick L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fields, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fierro, Herman H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fine, Phillip M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fink, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Finley, Craig A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Finnessy, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fisher, Colby D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fleming, Deborah C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Flemmings, David C., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fliss, Timothy S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Focht, Kenneth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Foote, Troy B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Forbes, Paul W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ford, Gregory S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Forshee, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fortier, Norbert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Foss, Cindy E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fountain, Darrell D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fox, Mark D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fox, Walter L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Francis, Bruce C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Franz, Steven M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Frawley, Christopher R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fredenberg, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Friedly, Douglas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Friedman, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fry, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fussner, Lawrence E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gaasbeck, Paul W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gaertner, Christopher W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gamble, Eddie L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gamboa, Diana, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ganoe, Marcia R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gapinski, Matthew, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garcia, Anthony D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garcia, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gardner, Kelvin G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garmer, Douglas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gaston, Angela M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gavilan, Rafael M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gayagas, Christine M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gehler, Christopher F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gennaro, Richard F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Georgas, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gethard, Barbara J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gialenios, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gibbons, Brian M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gibbons, Kevin P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gibson, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gilbert, James B., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gillman, Wesley G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Glen, Andrew G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Godfrey, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goldman, Glenn H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gomez, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gordon, Margaret M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goss, Joseph D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gowglie, Anthony M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Graboyes, Fredrick E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grayer, Gerren S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Greehey, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Green, Jerry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Green, Tobin L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Greene, Bradley D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grey, Alison E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grey, Jeffrey D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Griffith, Allen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grunow, Carl D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Guiler, Gerard K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Guinn, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Haase, Thomas K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hagen, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hagstrom, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Haight, Timothy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Halst, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hall, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hamilton, Byron K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hamilton, Scott R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hand, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hanlon, Edward S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hanlon, Tracy S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hansen, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harden, Monroe B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Haring, Ellen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harriman, Kelly A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harrington, Dennis J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harrison, Gail L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hartman, Arthur L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Haugen, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hauser, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hawley, Jeffrey W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hayes, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hayes, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Heath, Stanley N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Heaton, Wayne E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Heller, John E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Heller, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hempstead, Ronald R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Henneike, Barbra S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hernandez, Michelle M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Heun, Paul K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hewitt, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hickey, Suzanne C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Higuera, Janice, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hill, David E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hill, Dwayne T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hill, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hill, Greg F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hill, Jerry P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hillestad, John S., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hinton, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hluck, George S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hoadley, Jeffrey K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hogan, Daniel L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hogan, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hogan, Melvin S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hogan, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holbert, Conrad A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holden, Karla M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holiday, Hershel L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holmes, Eric T., xxx-xx-xxxx

Holtam, Susan G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hooper, James E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Horton, Richard N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hougnon, Teresa R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hovey, Jeffrey L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Howard, Rory J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hsieh, Peter T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hubbard, Kimball M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Huffman, Scott K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hull, Matthew M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Humphrey, Johnny M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hurley, Paul K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hutchens, Mather B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hutton, John E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hingham, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Iram, Lawrence E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Irwin, Bruce H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jefferson, William H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jennings, Wesley J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jezior, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Brent P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Derek, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Derek V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Jay K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Jeffrey W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Margaret A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Matthew A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Paul H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Todd M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, William C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jones, Kevin, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jones, Timothy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Joyce, Gregory D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kahn, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kaiser, Philip E., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kammerer, Gregory L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kammermann, Christian L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kane, Gregory C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kang, Hahn S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kastner, Edward F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kavanaugh, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Keating, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Keenan, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Keene, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kehrer, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kelly, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kemp, Steve W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kendrick, James L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kenney, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kenny, Paul F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Keppler, Timothy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kerle, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kershaw, Michael M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kester, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kidnocker, Karle L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kime, William O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 King, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kingston, Jeffrey M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kirby, John K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kleinschmidt, Edward F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Klingaman, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Klinkmueller, Christopher J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Klopsch, Norbert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Knapp, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Knickrehm, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Knight, Clifford T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Knight, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Knox, Tracy D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Koebberling, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kokoskie, Gregory A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kolev, Hermann, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Koziatek, Kevin M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kreipe, Stephen G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kuchinski, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kulich, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kulmayer, Joseph L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kuring, Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kwinn, Michael J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lacitignola, Frank, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Laqueument, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lagasse, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Laky, Peter G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lambert, Alexander L., II, xxx-xx-xxxx

Lambert, Garrett R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lambert, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lambert, Roger W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lambert, Wayne W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Landsberg, Karl D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Larsen, Jon A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lauer, Mark M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Laughlin, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lavender, Darryl J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lawrence, Terry G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lawrisuk, Andrew P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lawson, Lance A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lawton, Jean L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Leardi, Vincent J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lee, Bryant J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lee, Randall H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lenio, Susan A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lepine, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lescault, Maurice A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lewis, Brett G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lewis, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lewis, Thaddeus T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lindell, Kenneth K., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lindhardt, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Linehan, Maureen E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Linville, Gregory S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Little, Donald C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Livermore, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Livolsi, Timothy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lochry, Leslie E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Logan, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Long, Jay R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Loomis, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Loomis, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lopez, Ruben S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Luhrs, Stephen R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lukas, Timothy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lurie, Rod, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lutes, Walter U., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lutz, Royd C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lynch, Jason C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lynch, Walter, J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Macaluso, Dominic, xxx-xx-xxxx
 MacDonald, Bruce T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Madigan, Mark D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mahoney, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mahoney, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Maldonado, Hector M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Malloy, Gerald P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mangiona, Efrain A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Maraccini, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marigliano, Joseph V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marshall, Christopher J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martin, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martin, Jeffrey W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marziale, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Matthews, Keith E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Matuszewski, Douglas F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Matz, Donald C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mauro, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Maynez, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McChrystal, Peter S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCloud, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McClung, Joseph J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCormack, Michael E., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCormick, J. Scott, xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCracken, Richard R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McDonald, Amy S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McDonald, Joel E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McFadden, Timothy P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McGlothlin, Douglas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McGrail, John T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McGuire, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McGurk, Wayne F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McKenrick, Daniel P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McKinney, Stephen, xxx-xx-xxxx
 McMaster, Herbert R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McNair, Kerry V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McNally, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McNamara, John T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McRae, Arthur C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mearsheimer, Ellen, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meckfessel, Susan E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meehan, Kevin A., xxx-xx-xxxx

Meek, Darrin L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Melanson, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Menard, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mengel, Dean W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Menkhus, Mark T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Merrill, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Messina, Mark S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Messinger, Scott G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meyer, Karl F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meyers, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mickens, Stanley V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miguel, Susann M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miklos, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Millar, Charles B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Daniel B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Kent M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Warren R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Minear, Steven J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mitroka, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mock, Timothy E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Molinaro, Joseph W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Molloy, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Monsees, Rodney M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Monsen, Monrad L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moore, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moore, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moores, Leon E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morgan, Gregory L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morgan, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moriarty, Todd A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morin, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morin, Roger J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morris, Edward S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morris, Peter C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morton, Gary T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mothershed, David R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mottley, McCommon R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mowry, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mueller, Mark R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mular, Jeannie L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mullarkey, Matthew T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Munoz, Leonel, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murphy, Jerald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murphy, Kenneth F., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murphy, Randy P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Muska, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Muskopf, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Naccarelli, Carmine J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nagel, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nagel, Theodore J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nagy, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nappi, Frank R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nave, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Neese, Marty T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nelson, Harold W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nelson, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Neumiller, James E., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Newsome, Earl, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Newton, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nichting, David P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nocks, Andrew B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Noesges, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nordgren, Bradley P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Notto, Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nus, Paul F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nuzzo, Keith R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Atis, Demetrius C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Bermeier, Ralph T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Brien, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Brien, Justin M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Elberg, Gregory P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Guete, Joel, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Okamoto, Glenn K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Oldre, Keith A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Oliver, Ernest M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olney, Todd J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olson, Brian K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olson, Warren C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olvey, Patrick L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Orr, Crystal A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Orsini, Anthony M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Osmonson, Kenneth D., xxx-xx-xxxx

Overton, Troy B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pacheco, Christofer M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Paddock, Alfred H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pagano, Timothy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Painter, Deirdre, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Painton, Patricia M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pais, Francis C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pandza, Stuart M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Paniccia, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pannenberg, Mark, G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parietti, Michael I., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parker, Thomas O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Patton, Brian V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pauli, Mark R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Paull, Jeffrey J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Percy, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pedersen, Phillip A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pelosi, Richard E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Penny, William J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Penrice, Randal G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perez, Roman S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perkins, Roy E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perkins, Steven W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perkins, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perry, Stephen J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pesch, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peterson, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peterson, Paul M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Petring, Michael B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Phillips, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Picciuto, John A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pickell, Gregory A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pierson, Brian E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pinigis, Dennis J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Plante, David N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Poel, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Poisson, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Polanowicz, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Popovich, Peter A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Portigue, Robert J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Posey, Edward B., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Potak, Jacob L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pound, David S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pranti, Harry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Prentiss, Pamela A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Preston, Andrew J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Preston, Christopher B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Priatko, Daniel A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Prisk, Raymond A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pritchard, Robert R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Prosser, Brian D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Prukop, Harold K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Prusiecki, Mark J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pryor, Edwin G., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Quigg, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Quinnan, Heather M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Quintillian, Kenneth P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rainford, Wayne P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ramsdell, Gary J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rapp, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rariden, Jonathan L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rasmussen, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rathbun, Scott M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ray, Kyle W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Read, Frank D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reed, George L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reed, Joseph H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reeve, Darryl K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reich, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reilly, Michael N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reinhard, Susan L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reisweber, Glenn D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Renner, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rettke, Roger J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reusch, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reynolds, Livingston, Z., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reza, Reynaldo, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rhodes, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Riccardi, Michael V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rice, Daniel A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Richardson, Christopher J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Richardson, Ricky W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Richey, Randal S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ricks, Jimmy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Riegel, Mary L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rivera, Guillermo Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rizzo, Christopher J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rizzo, Dean H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roberts, Sharon D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robinson, Bruce E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robinson, Willard L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rocha, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roche, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rodriguez, Luis F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rodriguez, Oscar H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rogers, Beverly Y., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roosa, Stuart A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rosen, Mark L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rossi, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roth, Barry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rowe, Gregory F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rudinsky, Marjorie A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sabochick, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sajkoski, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Salvetti, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sanchezcastellanos, Armando, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sanford, Steven A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Santangelo, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sartiano, Joseph F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Saunders, Carol J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Savold, David P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sayce, Karl E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sbrocco, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scanlan, Patrick J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schaller, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scheide, Jeff S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schlabach, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schleeter, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schmidt, Jeffery C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schmidt, Laura A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schmitt, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schmutz, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schneider, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schossau, Joyce M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schubert, Andrew P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schumacher, Frank J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schuster, John N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schweitzer, Glenn G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schweppe, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schwitalia, Daniel D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scott, Robert W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Selee, Caroline E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Seto, Candace Y., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sgro, Jeffrey T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shadwick, Jan R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shaw, Everett M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shaw, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shea, Daniel M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shea, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sheeks, Gerald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shellman, Raymond V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sheridan, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sherrill, Ernest T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shimkus, David P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shorter, Kevin E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shuman, John H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shuster, Stephen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sibley, Steven E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simmons, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simon, Dana F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simpson, David T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sims, Alan N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sistrunk, Thomas M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Slabowski, George J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Slade, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sloan, John F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Daryl G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Derek R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Dorinda L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Forrest E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, John E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Lawrence J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Melody A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Philip A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Randy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Rodney A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Steven J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Troy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Snell, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Snider, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sobrato, Richard L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sodergren, Darrell J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Solley, Miracle D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sorenson, Milton W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Southard, Gary S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Southcott, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Southey, Robert G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sparkman, Gary N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sparks, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spaulding, Katherine L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spence, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spence, Timothy C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spitzer, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spurrier, Clark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Staats, Richard C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stanley, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 St. Clair Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Steele, Marcus E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Steils, John A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Steiner, Daniel W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stephenson, Adam B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stephenson, Lloyd A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stephenson, Ricky G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sternhagen, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stokes, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stone, Robert J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stover, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stickland, Stephen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Strycula, Heidi A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stuart, Jay B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stuban, Lydia M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stubblebine, Kevin J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stump, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Suchan, William K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Suhr, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sullenberger, Jon D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sullivan, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sultemeier, Chris T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Suter, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Suzuki, Michael Y., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Szytko, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tai, Neville P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taney, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tapp, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Rick W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Steven D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Troy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Teel, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Bryan K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Fern J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Jerome E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Susan G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thoms, Lawrence F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thornton, Gregory D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thornton, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thrasher, Kenneth F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tiger, Blair A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tindall, Theron W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Titchen, Judson M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tokar, Jeffrey M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tolzmann, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tomasovich, Kurtiss L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Toro, Wanda T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Torres, Manuel A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tortora, Salvatore, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Towe, Jerry L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Trainer, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Trigg, Edward L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Triplett, Mark W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Trujillo, Joseph L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tunnell, Harry D., IV, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turinski, Drew A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turner, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turner, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turner, Robb E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vanalstyne, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Veervaert, Glen G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vessels, Patrick G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vezau, Bernard G., xxx-xx-xxxx

Viggers, David K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vignola, Phillip A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Villanueva, Francisco B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Visnovske, Mark L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vuskalns, Oskar P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wahwassuck, Brigitte T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wakeland, Scott T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walko, Thomas D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wallace, Kevin J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walsh, Cathleen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walsh, Timothy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ward, Elizabeth I., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ward, Terry T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Washer, Lawrence R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Waters, Anthony J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Watford, Roslyn A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Watson, Bettyann S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weckel, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weis, Peter J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weiss, William N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Welch, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Welch, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wentworth, Edward H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wepking, Brian C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Werner, Cynthia E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Werthman, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weston, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whaling, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whalley, Lawrence G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 White, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 White, Ronald O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 White, Rory G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 White, Samuel R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilks, Henry G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Lawrence E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Shaun H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Willis, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Christopher E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Tee G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wink, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wise, Gregory A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wise, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wock, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wohlever, John, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wojtalewicz, Philip W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wolfkill, Douglas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wood, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woodmansee, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wooley, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woolf, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wray, Patrick M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, Donald C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, Millicent J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wuestner, Scott G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wycoff, Brian F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yoder, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zaenker, Lawrence A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zarone, Arthur J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zunde, Aldis L., xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

Bradley, Kent L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brucker, Wallace B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cho, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clark, Gary W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Farber, Gerald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hammond, Steven W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lawson, Jeffrey A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lein, Brian C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Colin K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Molinari, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Myhand, Rickey C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Oettinger, Jeffrey M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Oglesby, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peoples, George E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Porambo, Albert V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rowe, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scales, Darrell K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Showerman, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wiggins, David S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Xenos, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx

IN THE NAVY

The following-named commanders of the

Reserve of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of captain in the line, in the competitive category as indicated, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States, Code, section 5912:

Abel, Edward Ronald
 Ackermann, Peter Gross
 Acosta, Gilbert
 Adaschik, Anthony Joseph
 Ahlback, James Francis, Jr.
 Anathan, Robert Peter
 Anderson, Ernest John, Jr.
 Annin, Timothy Edwards
 Arndt, William Dale
 Army, Louis Wayne, III
 Bailey, Carlyle K.
 Bailey, Gerald Melvin
 Barrett, Edward Louis, Jr.
 Batchellor, John Kenneth, Jr.
 Bates, Ollie Burton, III
 Beaudry, Frederick Howard
 Benner, Francis Joseph
 Benson, Michael John
 Berner, Kenneth Charles
 Beshore, Charles Stephen
 Bewick, James Stephenson
 Blood, Kenneth Lee
 Boyle, Louis Edwin
 Brown, Lawrence Owen
 Bruce, Robert S.
 Buehrer, Charles F.
 Bullard, Walter M.
 Burton, Michael Coakley
 Butler, Samuel Bowman
 Cann, John Pearce, III
 Carlson, Gary Lee
 Caspero, John Francis, Jr.
 Chamberlain, Larry Dean
 Chapman, Donald Ray
 Chastain, Jeffrey Michael
 Clow, Gordon Henry
 Coffey, Thomas Edward
 Coleman, Walter Stuart
 Collins, Joseph Stanislaus
 Colvett, John Howard
 Connel, Allan Archibald, III
 Conti, Rodney Reid
 Cooper, John Byrne, Jr.
 Couch, Dale Myles
 Coughlin, Joseph Albert, Jr.
 Crisp, Howard Leon
 Crow, Lewis Nelson
 Cutter, Douglas Boyd
 Daley, Paul Patrick
 Dambaugh, John Arthur
 Deforth, Peter Wallace
 Detrick, Ernest Miller, II
 Devoe, Carlyle James
 DeWolff, Maurice Konrad
 Dobbs, William David
 Dodge, Henry T.
 Donaghy, Francis Donald
 Donahoe, David Francis
 Donahue, James William
 Dougherty, Charles Wilbur
 Douglas, Lawrence Henry
 Duffy, Denis Charles Jr.
 Dyer, Charles Arnold
 Eatman, George Thomas
 Edge, Jacob, II
 Emerson, John Michael
 Erickson, James Edward
 Erickson, Richard Paul
 Eittel, Edward Emil, III
 Fabre, Frank Joseph, Jr.
 Fagan, William Ambrose, Jr.
 Flint, William Kinmont
 Florimonte, Thomas S.
 Foerster, Bruce Somerndike
 Foster, Charles Wesley, III
 Foster, James William
 Foster, Vincent Edward
 Fredrickson, Robert Barker
 Gadeken, Arlan Duane

Gallagher, Charles Joseph, Jr.
 Gamboa, Jose Carlos
 Gareffa, Joseph John
 Gates, Charles Robert
 Geehr, John Edward
 Georgius, David Russell
 Gerard, Maurice William
 Giovinazzi, Felix Anthony
 Gohstand, Robert
 Gosse, Clinton Gessner
 Goudy, Ronald Carl
 Graham, Charles Rogers
 Graves, Kenneth Ernest
 Green, George Leblanc
 Green, John Montgomery
 Greenwood, Jeffrey George
 Griffith, Larry Lamar
 Hammond, Michael Moran
 Harder, Henry Louis
 Harding, Theodore Peter
 Harper, Robert Lawrence
 Harrington, Robert Leonard
 Harris, Carroll Nelson, Jr.
 Harris, David Albert, Sr.
 Harris, Jerry Lynn
 Harris, Larry Clarenc
 Harris, Murray Stevens
 Harris, William Arthur
 Haslup, Charles Leroy, III
 Hauff, Richard Anthony
 Heim, David Leo
 Hendricks, James Turpin
 Herbert, William George
 Hester, Gerald George
 Hiddleson, Don Eugene
 Hille, Howard Brand
 Hobbs, William Homer
 Hoff, Kenneth Lincoln, Jr.
 Hollett, Grant Thomas, Jr.
 Hollister, Wayne Edmund
 Hooper, Robert Moore
 Horan, James Joseph
 Horn, Dennis Lee
 Horton, Douglas James
 Houk, Thomas Leroy, Jr.
 Hughes, Arthur Charles
 Humphries, Charles Shore
 Hunt, James Vaughn
 Jeffords, Douglass Corcoran
 Jenkins, Tim McCall
 Jobe, Jerry Lynn
 Johnson, David Kent
 Johnson, Leonard E., Jr.
 Johnson, Philip Homer
 Johnson, Weston Macleod, III
 Keasler, Warren Kent
 Keeney, Malcolm Shermer
 Keltner, Jerry Martin
 King, Kenneth Pierce, Jr.
 Klaas, John Earl
 Kline, Russell Leonard
 Koch, Robert Curtis
 Kolgen, Peter James
 Kost, John Gregory
 Krauss, Gary Andrews
 Kristiansen, Walter Konrad
 Kuhl, Russell W.
 Lambert, Ray B., Jr.
 Lange, Walden Alfred
 Lapierre, Valmore Michel
 Lawrence, Gerald Samuel
 Levicki, John Sullivan
 Linquist, John E.
 Lipscomb, David
 Lizer, Darryl Merwin
 Long, William K.
 Lopezcepero, Henry
 Lorentzen, Gary Carl
 Lowes, Glenn Stewart
 Maddock, George Albert
 Mall, Phillip Joseph
 Man, Robert Martin, Jr.
 Markowicz, John Charles
 Marsh, Charles Lee, Jr.
 Marshall, John Stevenson

Maruszewski, Richard F., Jr.
 Mathews, William M., Jr.
 Matsunaga, Jerry Tadashi
 McGinnis, Dennis Robert
 McGuire, Jeremiah James
 McIntyre, Richard Thomas
 McLendon, Dana Crosland, Jr.
 McMorrow, Martin John Kalani
 McPartlin, Raymond Peter
 Mealey, Thomas Henry, Jr.
 McCleary, Read Blaine
 Meeker, Ronald Keith
 Mickelson, Charles Alan
 Miller, John Kellett
 Milliken, Jeffrey Allan
 Mirkovich, Joseph Nicholas
 Mitchell, Michael George, Jr.
 Mitchell, Reginald P., Jr.
 Moeller, Roy Paul
 Moore, James Glenn, III
 Moore, Rueben Earl, Jr.
 Moore, Wilmot Henry
 Morgan, Larry Francis
 Morrill, James Preston
 Morris, Robert Henry
 Morrison, Hugh Edward
 Mungan, Gerald Bernard
 Murphree, Edwin Key
 Neiner, Bruce Ray
 Nelson, Noel Edward
 Newton, Morris Douglas, Jr.
 Nicholas, Douglas Russell
 Nielsen, Frances Carson
 Nielsen, Robert Gordon
 Nixon, John Richard
 Nolan, James Stuart
 Norrell, Robert Frank
 Nugent, Thomas Harold
 Nunn, Paul Geoffrey
 Odell, Jack Denton, Jr.
 O'Hanlon, James Patrick
 O'Hara, Ramon Darrell
 Orr, Charles Wesley, Jr.
 Ortlieb, Alfred Anthony
 Owens, Edward Harrison, Jr.
 Page, Charles E.
 Palmer, Richard Lee
 Parker, Robert C.
 Parks, Gary Lee
 Perlingiero, Clara Antonia
 Peterson, Douglas Dale
 Pettigrew, Kenneth William
 Phelps, Edwin Rice, III
 Polich, Robert
 Poust, Roy Newton
 Prendergast, Finis Homer, Jr.
 Quale, Gareth Denby
 Quinn, Robert Patrick
 Rakowski, William Julius
 Ratliff, James Roy
 Reed, William Carroll
 Reggiani, David Joseph
 Richards, Donald Kenney
 Richardson, Frederick Martin
 Riley, John Turner
 Rio, Manuel, Jr.
 Rivers, Jere Watson
 Rodriguez, Ramon
 Rozic, Joseph Thomas
 Ryan, James Paul
 Saiki, Kenneth Takao
 Salemi, Anthony John
 Sarnie, Robert Walter
 Savage, Donald Wayne
 Scanlon, Jerome Bradley
 Schroeder, Kurt Cleveland
 Schult, Richard William
 Schultz, Henry Francis
 Scott, Thomas Fletcher, Jr.
 Sedor, Stephen Michael, Jr.
 Sexsmith, Gerald Thomas
 Sexton, Charles Edmund
 Shardy, James Eugene
 Simmons, Charles Henry

Sites, Bruce Lee
 Sitten, Luther Fred
 Sjostrom, John Erik
 Slovacek, Richard Edwin
 Smith, Alan Brewster
 Smith, Bradford Donald
 Smith, John William
 Smith, Michael Raymond
 Smith, Richard Cole
 Smith, Ronald Edwin
 Spence, Charles Hudgins, Jr.
 Spencer, Gerald Leyton
 Stabile, Robert Anthony
 Stanley, Jones Harrison
 Stein, Thomas Forrest
 Sternberg, Daniel Myer
 Steudel, Edward Martin, Jr.
 Stewart, John Russell
 Stoddard, Richard Cleveland
 Stone, Charles Edwin, Jr.
 Strandberg, Josiah Robert W.
 Strickland, Thomas Horton
 Sudol, Walter Edward
 Swartz, Thomas John
 Swenningson, Aaron Paul
 Szarleta, Melvin Anthony
 Talbot, John Henry, Jr.
 Taulli, Frank Roger
 Taylor, Gary Windsor
 Tetrault, Roger Ernest
 Thompson, Guy Bryan
 Thur, James Aubert
 Tinker, Malcolm Hoagland, Jr.
 Tkach, George Kenneth, III
 Tollison, Alfred Clyde, Jr.
 Toncray, George Williams, III
 Torres, James Dade
 Traut, Arthur John
 Troidle, Thomas Noel
 Turner, James Edward, Jr.
 Turpin, Anthony Alexander
 Turpin, Robert
 Vonderlinden, Arthur F., Jr.
 Wade, Shelba Henry, Jr.
 Wallach, John Sidney
 Walsh, Bernard
 Walton, John William, III
 Ward, Michael William
 Waskom, John Bascom, IV
 Wass, Leonard Robert
 Watts, Robert Francis, Jr.
 Wessman, Richard Harold
 Westerfield, John Henry, Jr.
 Whitmore, Michael Keith
 Whittleton, Thomas Robert
 Williams, David A.
 Williams, Robert Steven
 Wojcik, Walter John
 Woods, Ronald Joe
 Wright, Frederick Marshall
 Wright, John Swindell, Jr.
 Yeatts, Gary Claude
 Young, Brian Austin
 Zech, Gary George
 Zetterberg, Forrest Larry
 Zondorak, Charles Joseph, Jr.
 Zupko, George Michael

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICERS (TAR)

To be captain

Ailor, Ronald Garth
 Bennett, Barry Ellis
 Cutillo, Richard Thomas
 Dooley, Roy L.
 Dowdy, James W.
 Fairbanks, Willie B.
 Fitzgerald, William E., III
 Glad, Howard Elliott
 Harness, Francis W.
 Harrington, James Joseph
 Haushalter, William Henry
 Heath, Jeffrey Myron
 Hilliard, Robert M., III
 Karlsson, Carl Richard
 Kauffman, Daniel George

Kohler, David Clark
 Leary, Robert Anthony
 Lewis, Maxwell L.
 Manderfield, Leonard L.
 McCluskey, Kenneth Andrew
 Messner, Hugh F.
 McLencop, Gerald Holt
 Murphy, Paul V.
 Murray, Michael Alan
 Parker, William Thomas, Jr.
 Pate, James Wilson, Jr.
 Silah, Robert Joseph
 Siren, William H.
 Stewart, James Lee
 Stout, Floyd Taylor, Jr.
 Stucki, John Howard
 Young, Gary William

ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS

To be captain

Chapman, Paul William
 Denning, Richard Grayson
 Gabala, James A.
 Krivan, William Robert
 Levy, Ivan Marshall
 Luethy, Walter Ernest
 McPherson, Luther F., III
 Murray, Robert Hendon
 Novak, Stuart Michael
 Resor, Joseph D.
 Sartori, Howard Joseph
 Scott, Gerald Wayne
 Spurgeon, Dennis Ray
 Vanduzer, Roger Elliott
 Varel, Constantine
 Warnes, Philip George
 Warwick, James Curtis

AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS
(AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING)*To be captain*

Bauer, Kenneth Hugh
 Bencze, Daniel Peter
 Manning, Kenneth Paul

AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS
(AVIATION MAINTENANCE)*To be captain*

Long, James Thomas
 Simmons, Joseph Lamar

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (CRYPTOLOGY)

To be captain

Bilbrey, Robert Reid, Sr.
 Butler, Theodore Harvey
 Carroll, Michael Anthony
 Johnson, William Robert, II
 Lytikainen, Robert Carl
 Mutton, James Orval
 Nugent, Daniel Andrews
 Satin, Joel Lewis
 Weidman, Robert Hulburt, Jr.

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (INTELLIGENCE)

To be captain

Alexander, Robert Cheston, Jr.
 Alley, James Austin
 Atcheson, Raymond William
 Baumgardner, Hugh Wirth
 Boerbon, Floyd Wallace
 Bott, John Ferguson
 Campbell, Cromwell B.
 Carpenter, William S.
 Carroll, Johnny Dean
 Celebrezze, Anthony J., Jr.
 Coughlen, Thomas David
 Davies, John Glenn
 Donato, Brian John
 Fantauzza, Charles Benjamin
 Floto, Peter Christian
 Fournier, Maurice Andrew
 Gallagher, Thomas Vincent
 Gilmore, Charles Philip
 Gin, Steven
 Gradick, Herman William I., Jr.

Grant, David Reginald
 Grant, Frederick Eugene
 Heacock, Gerald Stephen
 Hibbits, John Gordon
 Howatt, Franklyn James
 Kane, Byron Lyle
 Lambden, William Jon
 Lawrence, David Wilson
 Locke, Richard Evan
 Lohman, John William
 Loose, Ronald Russell
 Malicki, William Joseph
 Mattingly, William Herbert
 McMahan, Paul Douglas
 Mingle, Clifford Edward
 O'Donnell, Thomas Edmund
 Parsons, William Duval
 Perry, David Charles
 Prentice, Warren Lonsdale
 Pyle, Howard, III
 Ranalli, Michael Patrick
 Rudolph, Walter Paul, Jr.
 Salley, Leonard Bennett
 Schuhle, John Eric
 Scott, Glenn Allen
 Sensoli, Joseph Albert
 Shafer, Elwood Lewis, Jr.
 Shepard, Donald Woodworth
 Taylor, Sherry A. Hagerman
 Tulloch, Hugh Bockhammer
 Walsh, Owen Barrie
 Webb, Bert James
 White, Anthony Edward
 Wiens, Jerry Allen
 Williams, James Lewis
 York, Robert Edwin
 Young, Franklin Alden, Jr.
 Zwingle, Carvel Lwoods

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS INTELLIGENCE (TAR)

To be captain

Entas, Leon James
 Zickafoose, David Ralph

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (PUBLIC AFFAIRS)

To be captain

Cartwright, John Galen
 Durfer, Edwin Richard
 Frederick, John Charles
 Gartland, John Charles
 Graves, Roy Danner
 Kenny, Michael Francis, Jr.
 Lambdin, Phillip Eugene
 Lashley, James Edwin
 Moynihan, Daniel Joseph, Jr.
 Niles, Wendell Edward, Jr.
 O'Brien, Richard Paul
 Pitzer, Everett Scott
 Tomek, George Warren, Jr.
 Woodward, George Phelps, Jr.

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (GEOPHYSICS)

To be captain

Clark, Tony Franklin
 Grayson, Thomas Hilary

IN THE NAVY

The following-named Naval Reserve officers to be appointed permanent ensign in the line or staff corps of the U.S. Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 531:

Anderson, Richard P.	Mallette, James R.
Babin, Erica D.	McCole, George C., Jr.
Bauke, Gregory P.	
Borkland, Dennis W.	Redden, Mark E.
Carlisle, Holly L.	Robbins, Martin J.
Copp, Dennis W.	Sanchez, Guy R.
Fries, Charles A.	Vanderkamp, Martha M.
Ginn, Lelon L.	
Halter, Rondal J.	Williams, Richard N.
Herrington, John B.	Westberg, Steven J.
Kuehn, Robert B.	

Thomas A. Lemonds, Navy enlisted candidate, to be appointed permanent chief war-

rant officer, W-2, in the U.S. Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 555.

Thomas R. Miller, lieutenant, U.S. Navy, retired, to be reappointed permanent lieutenant from the Temporary Disability Retired List, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

Edward N. Ehrlich, ex-Naval Reserve officer, to be appointed permanent commander in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Naval Reserve, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 593.

The following-named U.S. Navy officers to be appointed permanent commander in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Naval Reserve, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 593:

Liston, Steven E. Sunder, Theodore R.

Charles V. Gordon, commander, U.S. Navy, to be appointed permanent commander in the Medical Service Corps of the U.S. Naval Reserve, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 593.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named U.S. Naval Academy graduates for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 531:

Adams, Daniel J., XXXX
 Adamus, Daniel E., XX
 Aguilar, Tomas J., XX
 Alberto, Glen, XX
 Alicea, Pedro R., XX
 Allen, Scott A., XX
 Andrews, Jeffrey A., XXXX
 Astrup, Kevin J., XX
 Augustine, John M., XX
 Aumuller, David F., XXXX
 Baker, Beverly M., XX
 Baker, Miles C., XX
 Baker, Rosser O., XX
 Baker, Thomas W., XX
 Barr, Paul V., XX
 Becker, Max A., XX
 Bigelow, Andrew D., XX
 Birdsong, Timothy F., XX
 Blue, William D., XX
 Booth, David A., XX
 Briggs, Tod P., XX
 Brown, Conrad N., XX
 Bruner, Turney A., XX
 Busmire, Terence E., XXXX
 Cable, John D., XX
 Campbell, Lundy J., XX
 Campbell, William K., XX
 Carradini, George S., XX
 Chimiak, Mark W., XX
 Cochran, Paul R., XX
 Collins, Edward L., XX
 Conklin, Jeffery A., XX
 Cooper, David O., XX
 Czechowski, Richard B., XX
 Deleon, Carlos E., XXXX
 Derald, James G., XX
 Desens, Mark J., XX
 Dinicolo, Gina M., XX
 Ditton, David A., XX
 Dixon, Kurt L., XX
 Donnelly, Charles R., XX
 Doyle, William G., XX
 Drummond, Brad C., XX
 Eaves, Kathy L., XX
 Everill, Kenneth A., XX
 Fairley, Maurice A., XX
 Faucher, William J., XX
 Fegan, Frederick M., XX
 Flippinger, Eric K., XXXX
 Fisher, Thomas E., XX
 Fortune, Idean J., XX
 Foster, James T., XX
 Frey, Gary R., XXXX

Gallagher, Thomas W., XX
 Garcia, Manuel, XXXX
 Gattuso, Douglas J., XX
 Gehan, Thomas K., XX
 Gerhardt, Michael D., XX
 Goff, Jan T., XX
 Gonzalez, Robert, Jr., XX
 Graves, Jay P., XX
 Gurbach, Glenn D., XX
 Hacker, Rudolph E., XX
 Haddad, Richard E., XX
 Hamm, James J., XXXX
 Harber, Jonathan D., XX
 Harrison, William M., XX
 Hartman, Jonathan E., XXXX
 Heaphy, Mark P., XX
 Herlong, George H., XX
 Hile, Michael K., XX
 Hinen, James W., XX
 Hobough, Charles O., XXXX
 Hogan, Patrick R., XX
 Holtkamp, Louis M., XX
 Horn, Thomas W., XX
 Howard, Kevin T., XXXX
 Intoy, Bienvenido P., XXXX
 Ivan, Thomas R., XX
 Johns, Michael F., XX
 Jones, Thomas M., XX
 Kircher, Konrad, XX
 Kizsee, Carlos P., XX
 Knapper, Roger K., XX
 Kocher, Bruce D., XX
 Krueger, Bernard J., XX
 Lenda, John D., XX
 Lindsay, Charles T., XX
 Litton, Andrew C., XX
 Luke, Thomas C., XX
 Lyons, Mark R., XX
 Marnane, Thomas C., XX
 Marr, Douglas C., XX
 Martin, Bradford L., XX
 Matteo, Michael D., XX
 McCann, Mark W., XX
 McCarthy, Edward C., XX
 McClary, David B., XX
 McGaugh, Steven L., XX
 McGregor, James A., XX
 McKelvey, Matthew J., XX
 McKinney, Billy L., XX
 Miller, Nathan H., XX
 Mize, Ralph D., XX
 Monahan, Kevin J., XX
 Mortensen, Thomas C., XX
 Mueller, Michael D., XX
 Mullen, Michael D., XX
 Murray, Glenn A., XX
 Murray, Joseph B., XX
 Murray, Michael J., XX
 Murtha, Brian C., XX
 Nelson, Scott K., XX
 Nichols, Alan R., XX
 Nicoson, Daniel R., XX
 O'Connell, William M., XX
 Olivier, Patrick D., XX
 Pagano, James J., XXXX
 Pagel, Rick A., XX
 Paulson, William A., XX
 Pease, Gregory W., XXXX
 Peters, Gerald A., XXXX
 Pettitt, David G., XX
 Petrosino, Frank M., XX
 Pfeiffer, Sharon E., XX
 Pitpit, Michael C., XX
 Poindexter, Scott H., XX
 Ratcliff, Blake D., XX
 Ridder, Samuel M., XX
 Ringel, Jeffrey T., XX
 Romero, Glenn R., XX
 Rosa, Ivan R., XX
 Rowsey, Robert R., XXXX
 Ryan, Leslie R., XX
 Schleicher, Donald H., XX
 Shepherd, Michael A., XX
 Shibe, Robert B., XX

Shupinski, Douglas F., XX...
 Sichler, Robert A., XX...
 Spearing, Scott S., XX...
 Stephens, William H., XX...
 Stolarski, Mark A., XX...
 Stolley, Brian K., XX...
 Stuart, Allan J., XX...
 Stys, Mark V., XX...
 Sullivan, Sean M., XX...
 Summerfield, Harry M., XX...
 Suriano, Douglas A., XX...
 Talamantes, Clarence S., XX...
 Taylor, James, XX...
 Thomas, Douglas P., XX...
 Vermaat, Maarten, XX...
 Wach, Raymond P., XX...
 Wagoner, Keith L., XX...
 Walton, Terrance B., XX...
 Ward, Harry P., XX...
 Weber, Jeffrey, J., XX...
 Weistroffer, Joseph K., XX...
 Wiggins, John W., XX...
 Wilcox, John B., XX...
 Wilhelm, James W., XX...
 Williamson, Timothy L., XXXX
 Wix, Roseann L., XX...
 Wrzeszcz, Branch O., XX...
 Yu, Michael D., XX...
 Zamka, George D., XX...

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following Reserve officers of the United States Coast Guard to be permanent commissioned officers in the grades indicated:

To be lieutenant commander

Rodney E. Smith Paul H. Garrity
 George A. Flanigan Robert M. Acker, Jr.

To be lieutenant

James J. Vallone Walter J. Brawand
 Francis L. Shelley III III
 Douglas R. Carlson Thomas M. Self
 David G. Michalski Steven D. Hardy
 Patrick T. Keane Scott S. Way

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Patrick L. Donahue, James X. Monaghan
 Jr. Roy P. Williams III
 Guy A. Tetreau Steve M. Sawyer
 Stephen P. Garrity Bruce J. Mayes
 Rhae A. Giacomini Darrell C. Folsom
 Charles W. Kaiser Thomas A. Bailey
 William D. Plunkett Francis R. Southcott,
 Lawrence M. Fontana Jr.
 Michael T. Covey Larry D. Cheek
 George Gill Arne O. Denny
 Paul D. Jewell William J. Uberti
 Earle G. Thomas IV William W.
 Danny R. Williamson Thompson
 Victor L. Tyber Christopher C.
 Jack V. Rutz Colvin
 Michael F. Moriarty Craig H. Allen

Executive nominations received by the Secretary of the Senate April 23, 1984, under authority of the order of the Senate of April 13, 1984:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Michael Hayden Armacost, of Maryland, a career member of the Senior Foreign Serv-

ice, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, vice Lawrence S. Eagleburger, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Harold Peter Goldfield, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice Richard L. McElheny, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 24, 1984:

COPYRIGHT ROYALTY TRIBUNAL

Mario F. Aguero, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Copyright Royalty Tribunal for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 27, 1977.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Daniel Raul Lopez, of California, to be a Commissioner of the U.S. Parole Commission for a term of 6 years.

THE JUDICIARY

Edward Leavy, of Oregon, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Oregon.

William D. Browning, of Arizona, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Arizona.

Joseph J. Longobardi, of Delaware, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Delaware.

Terrence W. Boyle, of North Carolina, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of North Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, April 24, 1984

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT).

Dr. G. H. Chopourian, Armenian Missionary Association of America, Paramus, NJ, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Creator of the universe, and Father of humanity; we humbly and penitently approach You today in worship, standing in awe and yet joy at the marvels of Thy creation and the mysteries contained therein.

Man's inhumanity to man stretches back centuries, our Father, but today, on April 24, 1984, when the first genocide of a people was perpetrated 69 years ago between 1915 and 1918 our remembrance is of those more than 1 million Armenian Christian martyrs who preferred death to apostasy. They died of hunger in the hot deserts of Arabia; tortured on the way to their Calvary; drowned, shot, plundered, and abused in unspeakable ways. To hear, read, think, or speak about the atrocities, sends shivers down the spines of those who still have humane feelings left in them.

And yet, mystery of mysteries, a large number of the remnants of the genocide, while not having forgotten, have forgiven the perpetrators despite what we read and hear of Armenian terrorism against Turks by a small band of disillusioned nihilists. It is the grace of God that enables many to be such forgiving witnesses, and perchance as a result of the accumulated spiritual experience of a people who embraced Christianity in 301 A.D. We know deep down in our hearts, Creator God, that we who are alive today have a responsibility to humanity—to stand for justice wherever injustice prevails, to defend human rights wherever they are violated; to protect human lives wherever atrocities are perpetrated, knowing full well that our silence is a grave sin of omission which only encourages evil to be perpetuated by opportunists.

We pray passionately, our Father, that You may give wisdom to our President, Congressmen, and Senators to lead our Nation by their example and to make us conscious of our responsibilities to all people everywhere. But, above all, that as a moral nation we will stand as ally to truth and as protagonist to justice.

May Thy grace and spirit fall upon this House and enable the Members to rule by grace and good will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2048. An act to provide for the establishment of a Task Force on Organ Procurement and Transplantation and an Organ Procurement and Transplantation Registry, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating the calendar week beginning with Sunday, June, 3, 1984, as "National Garden Week."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House with amendments to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1097. An act to consolidate and authorize certain atmospheric and satellite programs and functions of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration under the Department of Commerce.

DR. G. H. CHOPOURIAN

(Mr. PASHAYAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, today we were honored to welcome Dr. G. H. Chopourian, executive director of the Armenian Missionary Association of America, who offered us our opening prayer.

Later today under a special order I have reserved, we shall mark the 69th commemoration of Armenian Martyrs' Day, which is being recognized throughout this Nation's Armenian community.

Dr. Chopourian is a survivor of this century's first genocide of a Christian people. His parents were uprooted and fled to Cyprus, where he was raised. Now a U.S. citizen, Dr. Chopourian is a graduate of the American University of Beirut, Lebanon. He received his doctorate from Temple University.

As executive director of the Armenian Missionary Association of America he coordinates the educational, relief, evangelical, and church development

work of an organization operating not only in this country but in Canada, Australia, Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, Syria, Lebanon, Cyprus, Iran, Greece, Turkey, and France.

I want to thank Dr. Chopourian for honoring us today. I know he shall be watching later as the House of Representatives takes a few moments again to commemorate Armenian Martyrs' Day.

CENSUS BUREAU MEETING VIOLATES FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT

(Mr. MATSUI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration has convened a panel of eight economists who might well have a major impact of how poverty is defined in America.

The panel will recommend whether noncash payments should be included in setting the poverty level—a move that could result in drastically reduced benefits for millions of Americans.

Despite its importance, however, the Reagan administration has decided to close this meeting to the public. What this means is that the administration's view and approach to poverty could be thrust on the American people without a fair hearing; without the opportunity for rebuttal; and without congressional input.

But what is more, Mr. Speaker, the administration's action is against the law, violating the Federal Advisory Committee Act. I urge my colleagues to join me in an open letter to the Census Bureau, requesting that their meeting stand the test of public scrutiny.

□ 1210

THE PEOPLE BACK HOME WANT CONGRESS TO REDIRECT FOREIGN POLICY IN CENTRAL AMERICA

(Mr. RATCHFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, during the recess, one message from my constituents came through loud and clear. In every corner of my diverse district, I heard "Congressman, this country is headed in the wrong direction in Latin and Central America."

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

Many constituents loudly objected to the mining of the harbors in Nicaragua. Others wanted to know how long we are going to pour military aid into El Salvador. And without exception, people wanted to know when Congress is going to do something about this misdirected foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, the people back home are right. Congress must begin to act to redirect our foreign policy in Latin and Central America.

SHIPMENTS OF LETHAL RADIO-ACTIVE WASTES TO BEGIN

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled over the imminent prospect that shipments of lethal radioactive wastes will be traveling on major roads in and around New York City.

These shipments would take place for the first time since 1975 after which the city along with 180 other localities slapped bans on such transporting. New York City's ban was overturned by regulations issued by the Department of Transportation in 1981. The city challenged the regulations and was upheld in Federal district court in 1982. That ruling was overturned by the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in 1983 and the Supreme Court refused to hear the city's challenge. As a result the shipments can now begin again.

New York City has filed a formal request with the Department of Transportation for a waiver from the Federal regulations until they can conduct a comparative study of shipment by barge of the materials. A spokesman for the Department was quoted as saying the letter "had been received and was under review." The city is owed a decision one way or the other. A nondecision on a matter of this importance to millions of people would be the height of bureaucratic indifference.

I am sending a telegram to Secretary Elizabeth Dole in support of the city's request and urging that a decision be made before the shipments begin. The overriding objective here must be the safety of the people of New York. We do not need a "day after" scenario before we act.

CRIME REFORM LEGISLATION SHOULD COME BEFORE HOUSE SOON

(Mr. DENNY SMITH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, back home in Oregon, people are growing more and more upset and con-

cerned about crime. And is it any wonder? My hometown of Salem is stunned over a rash of brutal slayings that have left seven young women dead or missing in 3 years. Last week, a State trooper was shot in the mouth allegedly by a 19-year-old man whom he suspected was a drunk driver. The suspect was released on bail a day or so later and then skipped town.

We are tired of living in the shadow of crime. We want to know why the courts and the Congress seem more concerned about the welfare of the criminal than with the safety of the law-abiding citizen/victim.

While Congress cannot make criminals into law-abiding citizens it can toughen the laws to prevent them from terrorizing the public.

For the sake of the victims and their families, and for all law-abiding Americans, please, Mr. Speaker, join with us, cooperate with us by bringing crime reform legislation to the floor of this House soon.

AMERICANS UPSET BY VIOLENT CRIME

(Mr. SHUMWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, having just returned from a week in my district, I can state with certainty that Americans are upset about the issue of violent crime, and distressed with their elected representatives for seeming insensitivity to their concerns.

Judging from the track record set by the House leadership, I cannot fault the public for that perception.

The Senate, reflecting bipartisan support for the critical issue of Criminal Code reform, passed the omnibus crime package by the vote of 91 to 1. Moreover, that action occurred promptly. The House leadership, by contrast, took 51 weeks after introduction of the measure to refer it to the appropriate judiciary subcommittees.

It is true that crime is largely addressed at the local level, but it is no less true that the Federal Government should demonstrate responsible leadership by taking appropriate action to fight such crimes as drug trafficking, and to institute bail reform. It would also be appropriate for us to establish constitutional procedures for imposition of the death penalty in cases of heinous crimes.

The week just passed was proclaimed by the President as Crime Victims Week. I believe we owe it to all Americans to at least debate this critical issue.

HOUSE SHOULD SCHEDULE ACTION ON COMPREHENSIVE CRIME CONTROL ACT

(Mr. PACKARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, there is something seriously and tragically wrong with our Nation's system of criminal justice when the victim of a crime pays more dearly than does the criminal. Every day we are shocked to hear of yet another criminal who escapes punishment due to a farfetched interpretation of the law. There is little concern in such decisions for the suffering of the victim.

If our judges do not have the legal means or the courage to put criminals in jail and keep them there, then it is up to us to change the laws—to stop coddling criminals—to put some backbone in our courts, and to pay attention—at long last—to those who have been wronged.

I call on the majority of this House to schedule action on the Comprehensive Crime Control Act. We must not sit idly by for another session and allow the criminals to enjoy the protections they have been given over the last few decades while the rights of victims of crime continue to erode.

I do not believe there is any more pressing subject for action by this Congress than that of criminal justice reform. We ought to make comprehensive reforms before we go home—before we have another recess. There is no excuse for failing to act.

HOUSE MUST UNDERTAKE SWEEPING REFORM OF OUR JUDICIARY

(Mr. LUJAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to discuss the subject of judicial reform and the crying need for us to restore some semblance of sanity and evenhandedness to our Nation's court system.

I do not believe it is a secret to many Members of this House that the American people are fed up with the way in which the courts in the United States have catered in recent years to the offenders, the criminals, at the expense of the victims of crime. We have all read horror stories about crimes committed by repeat offenders who were out on the streets again almost before the arresting officer had finished writing his report on the latest crime. Some of these repeat criminals went on to commit even more heinous crimes—rape and murder. Some simply repeated the type of crimes they had already been arrested for.

Much of this sort of thing can be laid at the doors of judges who let themselves be persuaded by psychiatrists and psychologists that society is really the criminal, not the man or woman who pulled the trigger or wielded the knife.

If we believe that sort of thinking, we might as well lock up society and let the criminals roam free. And in a sense—in many of the high crime neighborhoods of our cities—that is precisely what has happened. The people are cowering behind their locked doors while the marauders run loose outside.

The House of Representatives should have no higher priority this year than to undertake a sweeping reform of our judiciary. I urge all of us to act to restore sanity to a keystone of our Republic before it becomes a universal symbol of derision and disrespect.

CONGRESSIONAL UNDERCUTTING OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I have taken a special order for this afternoon to discuss two recent examples of congressional undercutting of American foreign policy.

First, actions of a Member of the House who sent his staff member to a foreign country to get a report changed. The other a letter signed by 10 Members of this House to the Nicaraguan Government stating explicitly their opposition to U.S. policy and in effect inviting the Nicaraguan Government to get involved in American politics.

I have sent letters to the offices of all 11 Members involved and invited them to come over. I think it is very important that today we begin to discuss the legitimate boundaries for Congressmen to be involved in dealing with foreign governments in positions in which their own government is involved in competition or conflict with our Government.

CONGRESS GROSS NEGATIVE PRODUCT

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, the news on the economy is very good these days with the latest item being that the GNP is up, the gross national product of the United States of America.

But there is another GNP of which we are not so proud. That is Congress gross negative product.

□ 1220

This gross negative product, Mr. Speaker, includes a long laundry list: A negative product on immigration legislation; a negative product on bankruptcy; a negative product on bail reform; a negative product on death penalty reform; a negative product on the exclusionary rule; a negative product on as many things as are important in the Criminal Code reform that we are seeking as can be enumerated in 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Speaker of the House and his majority leadership to reverse this trend of the Congress GNP, this gross national product, and to begin to match the economy in its growth and in its proper place in American society.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

(Mr. KINDNESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, I used to care about the problems related to crime in our country. I still do, and I will in the days ahead. But right now, here in the House of Representatives, it appears that we do not care enough. We do not care enough to have brought to the floor of this House for debate the important questions that exist in the needs for reform in our criminal laws in this country that have been enumerated by my colleagues here today and at other times.

Our inaction on criminal justice reform is too much. We have gone too long. We have done too little. It is in this House of Representatives that the responsibility rests. The other body has acted, as has been pointed out, on all of the important points that are involved. Some of us have spent innumerable hours on the work in Congresses past, but this Congress is the time when something must be done, and it needs to be done at the urging and at the leadership of the House Democratic leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I implore you to move it.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 3457, SOIL CONSERVATION ACT OF 1984

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, H.R. 3457, the Soil Conservation Act of 1984.

It has been cleared with the minority. They have no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CRIMINAL CODE REFORM

(Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, every 23 minutes a murder is committed in the United States, a rape occurs every 6 minutes, a robbery every 58 seconds, and a burglary is committed every 8 seconds. Each year 30 percent of this Nation's households are touched by crime.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this House has the responsibility to consider measures to bring this alarming problem under control. While the Senate has passed a comprehensive crime control package by a vote of 91 to 1, the House has failed to even debate Criminal Code reform.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pity that our constituents cannot go out at night without fear of being assaulted or of coming home and finding their hard-earned possessions gone. It is a pity that the Democratic leadership stands by and does nothing to protect the citizens of this country.

I urge that the House consider the comprehensive crime control package that has been bottled up by the Democrat leadership for nearly a year now.

Mr. Speaker, let the crime bill see the light of day.

BAR STATES FROM TAXING SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to prohibit State governments from taxing social security benefits. This bill is necessary because last year Congress passed legislation taxing middle- and upper-income retirees on up to half of those payments. Unless Congress acts, many of these same retirees will pay State income taxes on the benefits beginning with returns filed in 1985. Twenty-four States either have current statutory provisions, or legislation pending that could make social security benefits subject to taxation.

Although I am opposed to the taxation of all pensions, at least the Federal taxation of social security benefits is intended to preserve some degree of solvency in the social security trust fund. The sole reason for a State government in taxing those same benefits would be to enlarge its revenues. The reason States can easily accomplish this is that most have laws that allow taxation patterns mirroring Federal practice.

Therefore, they use the adjusted gross income (AGI) reported on the Federal tax forms as the basis for an

individual's income to compute State tax liability. Some States have taken legislative action to exempt social security benefits from being included in taxable income. But it should not be left up to the States to remedy a gross injustice created by Congress. I do not believe that it was our intention to permit States to levy a tax on social security benefits when we approved the 1983 Social Security Act Amendments. The intention was to provide some protection for the social security system. It is grossly unfair for the States to raise revenues by singling out social security beneficiaries. We can correct the injustice with this bill, and I urge its speedy adoption.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOL PRAYER, BALANCED BUDGET, AND LINE-ITEM VETO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

(Mr. BROWN of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, all Americans stand in wonder and amazement that this House has refused to address the vital issues of our time. In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I would hope to offer a unanimous-consent request calling for consideration of amendments to permit voluntary school prayer, a balanced budget, and line-item veto.

The Chair has ruled that in order to make these requests I must have the clearance of the Democratic and the Republican leadership of this House.

This request has been cleared by the Republican leadership.

I would now yield to a spokesman from the majority leadership for an appropriate clearance.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, we hear no response. Apparently, the Democratic leadership is unwilling to permit these issues to come before the floor or to be considered by the Representatives of this country. It is clear to the American people who stands in the way of considering these three important issues: The Democratic leadership of this House.

Let us hope that they change their attitude and become willing to allow the Americans' House of Representatives to address these vital issues.

JUDICIAL REFORM

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, when a California court frees a triple killer because his confession to police was preceded by his comment that he was speaking "off the record"; when a judge in Texas suppresses evidence in a drug case because the defendant's statement that he had some "speed"

might have meant he was referring to—and I quote—"the name of a new laundry detergent"; when a rapist is released after a week of his sentence because the judge feels his physical condition would deteriorate behind bars; then something is seriously, tragically wrong with this country's judicial system.

I do not believe there are many more pressing subjects for action by this Congress than that of judicial reform. We ought to make comprehensive reforms before we go home, before we hold another recess. There is no excuse for not moving in this area.

For too long, Mr. Speaker, we have let the courts and the defense lawyers run roughshod over the rights of the victims of crime in this country.

If our judges do not have the courage or the will to put criminals in jail and keep them there, then it is up to us to change the laws—to stop coddling criminals—to put some backbone in our courts and pay attention—at long last—to those who have been wronged.

I challenge the majority in this House to schedule action on this matter. Do not stay idly by for another session while the criminals enjoy the freedom and the virtual immunity they have been given over the last few decades.

Let us act, Mr. Speaker, and let us do it now.

CENTRAL AMERICA

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the message from the Easter recess from my constituents is clear: Do something about our involvement in Central America.

They ask: "How can you allow the President to disregard the rule of law in the mining of the Nicaraguan harbors?"

They say: "Please assert your congressional role in the formulation of foreign policy."

"Don't you have any guts?" they say. "How long are you going to allow the President to continue to run foreign policy without the views of the American people and the Congress?"

Mr. Speaker, as the Central American issue becomes the key foreign policy matter before this country, it is time that this body and the Congress assert its role, assert the role of the people in this country and challenge the President on a foreign policy in Central America that is not working, that is senseless and that is counterproductive.

THERE IS A LOT RIGHT WITH AMERICA

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, this is a problem-solving job, being a Member of Congress.

Constituent calls about social security and food stamps are problems that we eagerly solve.

We then turn to national and international problems pleading for solution. National deficits, foreign policy, nuclear control all represent the ultimate in problem dilemmas.

In fact, when we return home for a work period, it is tempting to keep the problem mentality and talk only of what is wrong with our country.

During the Easter week back home, however, I was reminded by my constituents about some of the things right with America.

No. 1, our young people, bright, energetic, very talented, they are our strength.

No. 2, our willingness to sacrifice is still alive. John Kennedy said it a generation ago, telling us not to ask what the country can do for you.

The people are ahead of the politicians on this issue. They are still willing to sacrifice for their country.

And, finally, we still accept the responsibility of leading the free world, whether that be in fighting hunger in Africa or supporting freedom fighters in El Salvador.

We do have many problems; we have a long way to go. But I thank the people for reminding me that there is a lot right with America.

So, "problem-solvers," while we remember what is wrong in America, let us not forget what is right.

□ 1230

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5, Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received at 12:30 p.m. on Friday, April 13, 1984, the following messages from the Secretary of the Senate:

- (1) That the Senate passed H.R. 3867; and
- (2) That the Senate agreed to the House amendments to S.J. Res. 210.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely,

BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 24, 1984.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5, Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit sealed envelopes received from The White House as follows:

(1) At 4:00 p.m. on Friday, April 13, 1984 and said to contain a message from the President wherein he transmits the 18th Annual Report of the National Endowment for the Humanities covering the year 1983;

(2) At 4:10 p.m. on Tuesday, April 17, 1984 and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits the 5th Annual Report of the Federal Labor Relations Authority which covers Fiscal Year 1983; and

(3) At 4:10 p.m. on Tuesday, April 17, 1984 and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits the 27th Annual Report on the Trade Agreements Program 1983.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

18TH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES COVERING THE YEAR 1983—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, April 24, 1984.)

27TH ANNUAL REPORT ON TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM 1983—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, April 24, 1984.)

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY COVERING FISCAL YEAR 1983—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, April 24, 1984.)

THE TIME IS NOW FOR A CRIME BILL

(Mr. LOWERY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, the good news is that crime is down significantly in every region of the country and in every category of serious crime. The bad news is that the House leadership is stalling on the President's crime bill that deals with the criminals still out there.

San Diegans I spoke with over Easter recess think the House is guilty of criminal neglect. In February, the Senate passed a comprehensive crime reform bill by a bipartisan vote of 91 to 1 in favor. But it took the House leadership 51 weeks just to refer the President's crime package to the relevant subcommittees.

A falling crime rate can make it possible to devote more effort to canceling unsolved crimes. But without a crime bill, problems like bail reform, sentencing and the exclusionary rule are left twisting in the wind.

Ultimately, which party gets credit for addressing the crime problem will be eclipsed by who deserves the blame for undermining our criminal justice system.

LET US TALK WITH THE SOVIETS

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, the President has taken significant steps in recent days to reduce international tension and to promote peace. He is on a roll, I would like to see it continued all the way to a long overdue summit with the Soviets.

All of us should applaud the President for his courage in putting aside long-felt enmity to visit the People's Republic of China. It was not so long ago that the thought of any President—particularly this President—visiting the world's most populous nation seemed out of the question. But now

Ronald Reagan is making this great leap forward—a move that can only make the world a safer place.

In addition, the President has just put forth a bold initiative in Geneva—a proposed treaty to ban the testing, production and use of chemical weapons. And President Reagan wrote recently to Premier Chernenko—who is now President Chernenko expressing a viewpoint that must guide our foreign policy: "We must insure that our differences—however large—are not resolved by force."

I would urge the President, though, to take one more step to build on that hopeful initiative. The President should call for a summit with Premier Chernenko.

Talking with the Soviets is not a sign of weakness, but one of confidence and hope. Just as meeting with the Chinese can only help create an atmosphere of better understanding despite continuing disputes, a meeting with the Soviet leader could only inch us away from the nuclear precipice.

We have much to discuss with the Soviets, I am not under any illusion that a summit would miraculously transform Soviet-American relations. But a journey of 1,000 miles must start with the first step. Let us take that step.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

(Mr. LUNGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, today, I must ask with many of my colleagues: Does the leadership of this body really care about the fact that crime is one of the foremost considerations on the minds of the American people? According to the December 27, 1983, edition of USA Today, the following question was posed to readers: "What worries you most about 1984?" Under the subject of crime 62 percent of the respondents described themselves as "very worried." It might be noted that this contrasts with the response concerning the threat of nuclear war where 52 percent described themselves as very worried.

It must be queried that if this is truly the "peoples house" why so little of our attention has been given to the crime issue by the House leadership? You will recall that we spent a total of 37 hours and 12 minutes debating the nuclear freeze issue and if the concerns of the American people have any correlation with what we do in this Chamber it would seem appropriate that at a minimum, the subject of crime should be given equal billing.

It is time to put partisan politics aside and to move ahead in a bipartisan manner as has been done in the other body on omnibus criminal jus-

tice reform. The fact that the conceptual framework may have originated with a Republican President should not be a relevant consideration. The crime issue should be by its nature a bipartisan social phenomenon. It is no respecter of party affiliation in that Democratic constituents as well as Republicans are all to frequently the prey of muggers.

It is time for the leadership of this Chamber to put politics aside and follow the lead of the other body in enacting substantive criminal justice reform. It is time for the House leadership to demonstrate to the American people that they care.

RESTRICTION OF SOVIET TRAVEL IN ARIZONA MUST BE REINSTATED

(Mr. RUDD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, the State Department recently revised its list of areas in the United States opened and closed to travel by Soviet diplomats.

As a result, the Phoenix and Tucson areas, as well as Graham, Greenlee, and Yuma Counties in Arizona were all opened to Soviet diplomatic travel.

The presence of high technology and defense-related industries has made Arizona a prime target for Soviet espionage.

For this reason, I have been in touch with Secretary Shultz to urge reconsideration of the Department's revisions. I am distressed that to date, I have received a response expressing only sympathy, but no intention of taking action to rectify this situation.

In my view, the State Department's travel revisions represent an open invitation for the Soviets to pursue U.S. Defense secrets.

The Arizona Legislature recently adopted a memorial calling upon the Secretary to reinstate the restriction on Soviet diplomatic travel in Arizona. I commend the legislature's efforts and again call upon the Secretary to reconsider the travel revisions. I include the Arizona memorial for printing in the RECORD at this point.

[State of Arizona, Senate, 36th Legislature, Second Regular Session, 1984]

SENATE CONCURRENT MEMORIAL 1001

A Concurrent Memorial: Urging the Secretary of State of the United States and the Members of the Arizona Congressional Delegation to support the Restriction of travel by Soviet Diplomats in this State

To the Secretary of State of the United States and the Members of the Congressional Delegation from this State;

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

Whereas, the United States Department of State recently amended diplomatic travel restrictions so that Soviet diplomatic personnel in the United States now have access

to Phoenix, Tucson and Yuma from which they had previously been barred; and

Whereas, the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, William Webster, was quoted in the Washington, D.C. "Times" of April 25, 1983 as saying "there are about three thousand Soviet bloc diplomats in the United States and thirty to forty per cent pursue U.S. secrets especially military information and laser and computer, technology"; and

Whereas, in addition to important military bases in this state there are according to the Arizona International Trade Directory a large number of firms located in this state whose operations make them prime targets for Soviet technology espionage.

Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, the House of Representatives concurring, prays:

1. That the Secretary of State of the United States and every Member of the Congressional Delegation from this state support the restriction of travel by Soviet bloc diplomats in this state.

2. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit copies of this Memorial to the Secretary of State of the United States and to each Member of the Congressional Delegation from this state.

Passed the Senate—March 15, 1984, by the following vote: 29 ayes, 0 nays, 1 not voting.

Passed the House—March 29, 1984, by the following vote: 42 ayes, 8 nays, 10 not voting.

Filed in the Office of the Secretary of State, April 2, 1984.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 373, ARCTIC RESEARCH AND POLICY ACT OF 1983

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 482 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 482

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 373) to provide comprehensive national policy dealing with national needs and objectives in the Arctic, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of sections 303(a)(4) and 401(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order by this resolution, and which shall continue not to exceed one and one-half hours, one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology, and thirty minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology now printed in italic in the bill as an

original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, said substitute shall be considered for amendment by titles instead of by sections and each title shall be considered as having been read, and all points of order against said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7, rule XVI are hereby waived. In lieu of the amendment to title I of said substitute recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now printed in boldface roman in the bill, it shall be in order to consider an amendment to said title printed in the Congressional Record of April 9, 1984, by, and if offered by, Representative Fuqua of Florida, and said amendment shall be considered as having been read. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1240

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BIAGGI). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEVITAS).

NEED FOR REVISION OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL CODE—BUT LET'S BE HONEST ABOUT IT

Mr. LEVITAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not able to participate in the 1-minute speeches during the time allotted, but I have heard speaker after speaker today talk about the need for consideration of the Criminal Code, and I agree and certainly hope we do that. I would like to see it done. But let us be honest about it. What I do not appreciate is the political claptrap and demagoguery that went along with that request, talking about burglary and rape and robbery, when every speaker who made that statement knows that the rapes and burglaries and robberies and crimes on the streets in California or Pennsylvania or Georgia are not covered by this Criminal Code. Those crimes, and the fears and concerns they engender, are almost entirely covered by State law, not Federal law. State law and State law enforcement need to be improved, as does Federal law and Federal law enforcement. But do not fool the public that the Federal Criminal Code revision will have significant impact on most street and local crime.

This is a Federal Criminal Code, which does need to be revised and is similar to one President Reagan vetoed about 2 years ago, and I hope we do consider it. But if the people who are talking about rape, burglary,

robbery, and crime of that sort as being affected by this Federal law change, they either do not know any better, or they ought to know better. If they are simply engaging in political demagoguery for partisan political advantage, the American people are not that stupid. They understand and they see through it. They know we need to fight State crimes with State law and State enforcement against those types of street and local crime. And they know we need to improve our Federal Criminal Code for many reasons even if it does not deal with most of the crimes in our communities which we are all concerned about.

Both of these problems are so important that we should not play partisan political games about them and we should not try to deceive or lull the public into thinking that the needed reform of Federal criminal law will have a direct impact on the crimes covered by State laws which are the vast majority of the violent crimes of murder, rape, robbery, burglary, and the like.

We must work together, and not as political partisans, to combat crime honestly and effectively.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TAYLOR), and pending that I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 482 is an open rule providing for the consideration of S. 373, Arctic Research Policy Act of 1983. Two hours of general debate shall be divided between the two committees that reported this bill, with 1 hour and 30 minutes of debate to be allocated to the Committee on Science and Technology and 30 minutes of debate to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, the rule specifies that the Science and Technology Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill shall be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment. To facilitate the amendment process, the substitute shall be considered by titles instead of by sections, with each title to be considered as read.

After a series of hearings on national critical materials policy and research, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science and Technology recognized the need for improvement in the coordination of Federal policies and activities relating to materials critical to the Nation's economy and defense. As a result, title II of the substitute establishes a three-member National Critical Materials Council under the Executive Office of the President and charges it with the responsibility for advising the President and making recommendations to Congress on coordination and implementation of national critical materials policies and programs. However, Mr. Speaker, the

Senate-passed version of this bill did not address materials policy and therefore, title II is considered nongermane to an Arctic research bill. The Rules Committee granted the waiver of clause 7, rule XVI—the germaneness rule—to allow consideration of this substitute, but I would point out that any and all provisions of the bill would be open to amendment.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 482 waives points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with two sections of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. First, the rule waives section 303(a)(4) of the Budget Act which prohibits consideration of new entitlement authority first effective in a fiscal year before the first budget resolution for that fiscal year has been adopted. The waiver is necessary because the bill, as introduced, sets the rates of pay for members of the Arctic Science Policy Council and the Arctic Research Commission at level V of the executive schedule and GS-16, respectively. Since this new entitlement authority is first effective in fiscal year 1985 and since no conference report on the first budget resolution for fiscal year 1985 has been adopted, the bill violates section 303(a)(4) of the Budget Act.

The second Budget Act waiver in this resolution is of section 401(a) which prohibits the consideration of new contract authority unless such authority is limited to amounts provided in advance in appropriation acts. Since section 8 of S. 373, as introduced, would provide new contract authority which is not limited to advance appropriations, the bill would violate section 401(a) and thus the waiver was granted. However, the Science and Technology Committee substitute cures the Budget Act violations and the Budget Committee had no objection to technical waivers of sections 303(a)(4) and 401(a).

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries reported different versions of title I of this bill, but they are to be commended for their diligent efforts in developing a bipartisan compromise proposal for floor consideration of this measure. The rule provides that in lieu of the Merchant Marine Committee amendment to title I now printed in the bill, the compromise version of title I printed in the April 9 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Mr. FUQUA shall be in order.

Upon conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment, one motion to recommit with or without instructions would be in order.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation currently invests over \$100 million a year on Arctic research but there is little or no coordination of efforts among the more than 1 dozen Federal agencies,

the government of the State of Alaska, and the private sector.

Our policy initiatives and research in the Arctic region have been fragmented, and at times, unnecessarily duplicative. In an attempt to address the problem, title I of the bill establishes a five-member Presidential Commission to promote Arctic research and to develop a coordinated national Arctic research policy. It would also establish, within the National Science Foundation, an Office of Arctic Research.

Mr. Speaker, 20 percent of our Nation's domestically produced oil is found in the Arctic region and approximately 16 percent of all proven reserves of natural gas are located in Arctic Alaska. This region is of vital interest to our Nation.

We are the only country bordering the Arctic Ocean that does not have a comprehensive Arctic research policy. This bill attempts to promote a change in that situation. I urge adoption of House Resolution 482 so that the House may consider this very important legislation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 482 is an open rule under which the House will consider legislation creating a presidentially appointed Arctic Research Commission to formulate a coordinated national policy for Arctic research.

In addition, the bill made in order by this rule, S. 373, establishes a statutory National Critical Materials Council to assist the President in developing our national policies regarding critical minerals and materials.

Mr. Speaker, S. 373 passed the other body in June of last year, and this rule waives section 303(a)(4) and section 401(a) of the Budget Act against our consideration of the bill.

As introduced, S. 373 violated these two sections of the Budget Act because it provided new entitlement authority first effective in fiscal year 1985 in advance of adoption of the first budget resolution by both Houses, and it contained new contract authority not limited to advance appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, the version of S. 373 reported by the Committee on Science and Technology made changes necessary to comply with the Budget Act, and these waivers are therefore purely technical in nature and are necessary to permit consideration of the bill and the committee amendment.

The rule provides that the Science and Technology Committee substitute now printed in italic type in the bill will be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule, and the substitute will be considered for amendments by titles instead of by sections.

The rule waives clause 7 or rule XVI, our germaneness rule, against the Science and Technology Committee substitute, because that committee added the language creating the National Critical Materials Council to the Senate-passed bill.

Mr. Speaker, following action by the Committee on Science and Technology, S. 373 was sequentially referred to the Committees on Armed Services and Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The Armed Services Committee was discharged from consideration, but the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported an amendment.

This rule makes in order a specific amendment, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 9, by and if offered by Representative FUQUA, in lieu of the committee amendment reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, the general debate on S. 373 will be allocated with 1 hour for the Committee on Science and Technology and 30 minutes for the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides the usual and customary language regarding separate votes in the House on any amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee substitute and allowing for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the two committees involved in this bill are anxious to more fully explain its provisions and I urge the House to adopt the rule so we may proceed directly to debate on the bill.

□ 1250

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING MEMBER NOT NAMED IN HOUSE RESOLUTION 482 TO OFFER AMENDMENT MADE IN ORDER UNDER THE RULE TO S. 373, ARCTIC RESEARCH AND POLICY ACT OF 1983

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to offer the amendment known as the Fuqua amendment to the Senate bill, S. 373, as provided for in the rule just adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask, has that been cleared with our side?

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is my understanding.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ARCTIC RESEARCH AND POLICY ACT OF 1983

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 482 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the Senate bill, S. 373.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the Senate bill (S. 373) to provide comprehensive national policy dealing with national needs and objectives in the Arctic with Mr. MATSUI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the Senate bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALGREN) will be recognized for 30 minutes, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) will be recognized for 30 minutes, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALGREN).

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring to the floor today for consideration by the House S. 373, the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1983. At the outset, I would like to give special thanks to the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Mr. JONES, for his diligent efforts in helping to move this bill. At this point, I would like to introduce into the RECORD the text of the letters between Chairman FUQUA of the Committee on Science and Technology and Chairman JONES regarding our mutual agreement concerning title I of this bill.

The letters are as follows:

COMMITTEE ON

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, DC, March 28, 1984.

HON. WALTER B. JONES,

Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to express my appreciation to you and the Members of your committee for your prompt and thoughtful action on the bill S. 373.

As you know, the staffs of our two committees have met and prepared an amendment that reflects the work product of the two committees. My committee is in agreement with the text of the amendment.

I do think it necessary to seek the further understanding however, that the jurisdiction of the Science and Technology Committee or the jurisdiction of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is not expanded or diminished by the respective action of the two committees on bill S. 373.

Sincerely,

DON FUQUA,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES,

Washington, DC, April 2, 1984.

HON. DON FUQUA,

Chairman, Committee on Science and Technology, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of March 28, 1984, regarding the action of our two committees on S. 373, the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1983.

Our committees have always worked well together on matters of mutual interest and our experience with respect to this legislation is no exception. The amendment developed by the staff has the bipartisan support of my committee and I look forward to supporting you on this measure when you bring it before the Rules Committee and to the floor.

Finally, I concur in your assessment that our mutual effort on S. 373 has not, in any way, expanded or diminished the jurisdiction of either of our committees.

With warm personal regards,

Sincerely,

WALTER B. JONES,
Chairman.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. PRICE, for his cooperation on the legislation. The bill was referred to the Armed Services Committee and it was discharged by them on March 16.

Mr. Chairman, the bill reported by the Committee on Science and Technology focuses on two important aspects of scientific and technological research as it relates to natural and industrial resources. Title I of the bill, the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1983, addresses the important issue of Arctic research policy and the research programs to implement such policy. This title establishes a five-member Presidential Commission to develop and recommend national Arctic research policy. It also designates the National Science Foundation as the lead agency responsible for implementing such policy, and calls for establishing a 5-year national Arctic research plan.

Title II of the bill, the National Critical Materials Act of 1983, focuses on coordination and implementation of all Federal critical materials programs. Consistent with the National Materials and Minerals Policy, Research and Development Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-479), this title establishes a three-member National Critical Materials

Council under and reporting to the executive Office of the President. The Council, among other things, will establish responsibilities and provide for the coordination of all critical materials policies and their implementation. The Council will make recommendations regarding budget priorities for materials activities in each of the Federal departments and agencies. The Council will focus attention for the private and public sectors on materials-related issues considered critical to the Nation's economic and strategic well-being.

Finally, special attention is given to establishing a national Federal program for advanced materials research and technology as well as to stimulating innovation and technology use in basic and advanced materials industries.

Mr. Chairman, let me comment briefly on the need for this legislation. Problems regarding policy for Arctic research have been brought to the attention of Congress over the last several years. Although the United States presently spends more than \$100 million annually on research in the Arctic region, these efforts are spread among more than a dozen Federal agencies, a State government, and the private sector, with little or no policy focus or coordination. The United States is the only country, of those bordering on the Arctic Ocean, without some central organization devoted to sustained planning and support of Arctic research. Although some efforts have been directed toward this need, Federal Arctic research still continues to be fragmented and uncoordinated. This has led to neglect of certain areas of research and unnecessary duplication of effort in other areas.

The Arctic area is of vital interest to this country. Twenty percent of our Nation's domestically produced oil is found in the Arctic, and about 16 percent of all proven reserves of natural gas are locked in Arctic Alaska. The Arctic is effectively our common border with the Soviet Union, and thus critical to national defense. The Arctic also represents a major natural environmental area necessary to the maintenance of ecological and biological diversity. In fact, the Arctic contains one of the largest unspoiled natural environments on the Earth with ecosystems of critical importance.

It also is the homeland of distinct indigenous cultures whose rights and needs must be carefully considered. Further, these unique native cultures provide invaluable expertise regarding the Arctic and its resources. Both the ecological environment and the human communities of the Arctic are highly sensitive to possible disruption as a consequence of development activities in this region. Thoughtful research and careful evaluations and planning are critically necessary to de-

veloping these national resources wisely. I believe our efforts with this bill take a strong step forward in providing for this planning and evaluation.

Turning to title II, we have found that modern industrial materials are the basis for almost all technological advances necessary for our Nation's economic well-being and security. Availability of such materials, either in the primary form as ore or in more advanced forms is critical to older "smokestack" industries as well as new advanced, high technology industries. The U.S. basic materials industry represents an annual economic output valued at \$20 billion. When translated into secondary, semifinished products, this value jumps to over \$200 billion or more than roughly 10 percent of our GNP.

Concern for materials and their importance to the Nation, though going back several decades, only became intensified with the oil embargo and subsequent energy crisis of the 1970's. Much effort and analysis at that time was focused primarily on the problem of import vulnerability and its effect on critical defense and aerospace industries. Such concern was based on our heavy reliance on importing important raw resources.

Though import vulnerability cannot be ignored, it has become clear more recently that attention must be shifted to new advanced materials and related technologies. The Nation's problems are as much economic as they are security-related. Japan, Europe, and others are applying advanced materials concepts and technologies to major high technology industries, such as transportation, communication, and computers. Advances in ceramics, composites, new electronic materials, and advanced materials processing will be key to our Nation's industrial and economic growth over the next decades. Though it appears that some aspects of these changes are recognized, the full appreciation of the range of problems and the means for dealing with them remains fragmentary.

While this administration has taken a number of steps to address materials concerns, testimony by industry, academia, and others has shown these actions as inadequate. While focusing on the important issues of minerals and mining, advanced materials concerns have been largely ignored. The Cabinet Council established by this administration to handle such policy matters, while potentially useful, has not been fully effective. The Council has met only infrequently on materials issues, on an ad hoc basis, without permanence or clearly defined lines of communication with the rest of the Federal Government. Perhaps more important, another administration with other priorities could easily abolish such a mechanism.

Title II takes the next logical step in dealing with critical materials by statutorily establishing the necessary mechanism for determining materials priorities and policies as well as the responsibilities for implementing any resulting programs.

Mr. Chairman, this bill represents the result of careful consideration by several committees over several years of these important issues. At the appropriate time, I plan to offer a substitute amendment to title I of the bill, which has been worked out with the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. I see this as a further refinement to improve this legislation. Thus, in final form, I believe the bill will do much to resolve the problems identified in our consideration of this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and vote for its adoption.

□ 1300

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I would like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his very expeditious manner in which he brought this bill to the floor and for his conscientious and very aggressive manner in which he reviewed the bill and I believe developed in a bipartisan manner an excellent piece of legislation.

The Subcommittee on Science and Technology, of which I am ranking member, has jurisdiction over title I of S. 373, and I rise in support of S. 373, as amended.

This bill contains a title II, the National Critical Materials Act, about which the chairman has just referred and on which I will not comment in-depth, but would rather leave the comment to Congressman Carney of New York who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Transportation, Aviation, and Materials.

Mr. Chairman, title I, the Arctic Research and Policy Act, has been the product of much cooperation between the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Committee on Science and Technology.

I would like to particularly single out the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. Young) for his exceptionally hard work on this legislation. In fact, as a practical matter, this legislation would not exist were it not for the extremely aggressive efforts of the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. Young) in this area. It is really his child.

The version under consideration today represents a compromise reached by both committees. It provides much needed coordination of research efforts currently underway.

I think it should be noted that of all the nations which are involved in the Arctic region, the United States is the

only country without an Arctic policy, and when you think that Canada, Finland, and the Soviet Union all have committed tremendous resources, especially the Soviet Union, to undertaking and understanding the Arctic region in a coherent, organized fashion, I find it rather exceptional and unfortunate that the United States should not have proceeded in such a way.

The Arctic region is filled with massive resources. It is strategically extremely critical and it is an area which is still to be explored and is exciting to man's imagination. Therefore, there should clearly be a policy addressing it and this bill as developed is an excellent approach toward representing that policy.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield, if it is appropriate, 6 minutes to the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Aviation, Transportation, and Materials, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 373. I believe both titles of this bill as reported out of the Science and Technology Committee deserve our support. However, as the ranking Republican on the Transportation, Aviation and Materials Subcommittee, I am particularly interested in seeing the Critical Materials Act adopted. That is the title I will be addressing in my remarks today.

I know there is opposition to this bill in the administration. I am aware that there are those who have sincere reservations about the need for this legislation. They believe it is redundant and perhaps even counterproductive because it will add a layer of bureaucracy and hamper current efforts to deal with the strategic minerals issue. Their concerns are real and I sympathize with those concerns. However, the critical materials issue is more than a problem of increasing our domestic productive capacity, although that is certainly a key issue. Materials policy should include a broad range of issues including national security, trade, the environment and advanced materials R&D. I believe the present lack of coordination in the materials area potentially wastes billions of taxpayer dollars, and I am optimistic that this legislation can help.

Today there are at least 20 agencies and offices involved in one way or another with minerals and materials issues. Materials R&D is being conducted in several different agencies and is further supported by the Federal Government through grants to universities and tax credits to the private sector. There is no shortage of activity in this area and it affects nearly every aspect of our lives. New materials, new materials processing methods, and new

manufacturing techniques are being developed which will significantly affect our progress in many other technologies as well. Clearly, these are complex issues which demand our attention.

Congress recognized the need for a strong coherent national policy to deal with the whole spectrum of materials issues in the 96th Congress when it passed the National Materials and Minerals Policy Research and Development Act of 1980. This legislation called for the administration to establish a mechanism for coordinating national materials policy. The administration responded by submitting a program plan which called for, among other things, the coordination of materials policy through the Cabinet Council on Natural Resources and Environment, chaired by the Secretary of Interior. That plan was submitted to Congress 2 years ago and although some positive steps have been taken toward developing a continuing U.S. minerals and materials policy, overall, the plan has not been effective. According to a recent GAO report, the proliferation of both actions and organizations to deal with materials issues actually add to the activities that need coordinating, and could make things worse, not better. They also cited several examples of recent actions that were not coordinated through the Cabinet Council but that should have been, further indicating that the approach taken by the administration to establish the needed coordination, however well-intended, has not been effective. Moreover, this approach lacks the continuity that is needed to develop and implement a long-range critical materials policy.

I believe that the establishment of a three-member Critical Materials Council, as mandated in this proposed legislation, is an appropriate response to the deficiencies that currently exist. This Council will have the responsibility for establishing a comprehensive national program for advanced materials R&T. Furthermore, they will coordinate the activities of the various agencies to insure that there are no unnecessary duplications and that they are directed toward the goals of this program.

This is not a bill for more government and more spending. On the contrary, this legislation offers potential savings. Currently, we have a situation where, all too often, the right hand does not know what the left is doing, and this usually leads to both hands being in the taxpayers' pockets. Also, I am not unsympathetic to the concerns that additional legislation will reduce management prerogatives in dealing with this complex issue. However, the proposed legislation gives the administration considerable flexibility in carrying out the objectives. I believe this bill has been carefully drafted to pro-

vide an effective mechanism for establishing the coherent national materials policy that we need without unduly burdening the administration with unnecessary bureaucracy. It had strong bipartisan support in committee—it was reported out of the Science and Technology Committee unanimously—and I urge my colleagues to join us today in voting to adopt this legislation.

□ 1310

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to join with my colleagues in urging the House to pass S. 373, as amended.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries received sequential referral of this legislation, and during its review, recommended changes only to title I.

Title I of S. 373 provides for the development of a single national policy to direct Federal Arctic research. It achieves this primarily in two ways. First, it establishes an Arctic Research Commission, composed of five members from academic or research institutions, residents of the Arctic, and private industry. It is the duty of the Commission to develop and recommend an integrated Arctic research policy.

Second, title I establishes an Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee, composed of representatives from numerous Federal agencies having Arctic research responsibilities. This interagency group is to survey Arctic research conducted by all levels of government, universities, and other public and private institutions, and to consult with the Commission in establishing priorities for future research in Arctic.

The Arctic region is an area of growing importance to the United States for resource development, environmental protection, and national security purposes. It is therefore essential that we take measures to assure that the necessary research vital to our interests in the Arctic is conducted. Title I will provide this, while also improving research operations. Such improvements will lead to more efficient, and therefore more cost-effective, project planning and coordination.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the committee on Science and Technology (Mr. FUQUA) and the subcommittee chairman (Mr. WALGREN) for their leadership on this legislation.

Our two committees worked together on this important bill in a very cooperative manner and the gentleman from Florida and his colleagues on the

Science Committee are to be congratulated for their effort.

On the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the distinguished Representative from Alaska, the ranking member of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, (Mr. YOUNG) was the guiding force behind this bill. He, too, is to be congratulated for helping us move S. 373 so quickly.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support S. 373.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PRITCHARD).

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984. I also support the amendment that will be offered by my distinguished colleague from Florida at the appropriate time. Arctic research is an area that has too long been lacking national focus and attention. This bill will provide for the development of a single, integrated national policy governing Federal Arctic research. The establishment and coordination of such policy is currently under the jurisdiction of no organization—government or private.

For many years, U.S. scientists, resource specialists, legislators, and citizens have pleaded the case for a coherent set of science policies and research programs to meet national needs and objectives in the Arctic region. Currently, the U.S. capability and performance lags behind other circumpolar nations engaged in Arctic research and resource development. One of the more significant Arctic issues that we will confront in the 1980's centers on energy production. In the areas of both nonrenewable and renewable resource development, the United States will benefit from research on resource extraction, resource management, and the environmental safeguards necessary to protect the Arctic tundra. The Arctic is also a prime laboratory from which to study the air-sea interactions that influence the Nation's weather. Such studies require not only U.S. research efforts but multinational participation because of the wide expanse of territory involved and the global implications. This legislation will provide the impetus for research to address these kinds of needs.

The Nation needs our commitment to involve the scientific and engineering manpower and dollar resources necessary to operate effectively, efficiently, and wisely in the Arctic. Of primary importance is learning how to live and work in the Arctic region in a manner which will enhance and protect the societal, cultural, political, environmental, and resource development values of our Nation. I urge my colleagues to support this important Arctic research bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1983, and urge my colleagues to do the same. The spirit of compromise and the desire to ultimately arrive at legislation that will bring national policy in the Arctic areas of the world into line with our international responsibilities were major guiding principles for the consideration of this bill in the House. I would like to thank Chairmen DON FUQUA and WALTER JONES for the stewardship of this legislation through their respective committees. In addition, I would like to personally thank DOUG WALGREN and JUDD GREGG of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology for the hard work and time spent on this bill—the efforts for their committee staff in constructively altering the legislation to address national and international concerns was most appreciated. It is a testament to their hard work and good intentions that we are finally on the floor with a good bill.

Mr. Chairman, the Arctic area of the world is one unlike any other on Earth. Although we have a long commitment to extensive research in the Antarctic pursuant to our international obligations, we have no coordinated, coherent policy in the Arctic. This legislation represents a forward-looking initiative by the Congress to address this shortfall in our understanding of the Arctic and the ways it affects our everyday life.

Everyone knows of the incredible resource wealth that the Arctic holds—now that construction of the Alaskan oil pipeline is delivering 20 percent of our daily domestic production of crude oil to energy consumers in the lower 48. But there are very important aspects of the Arctic that are not so well known. For example, it serves as our only common border with the Soviet Union, and the Soviets have an ongoing program of research into the logistical problems incumbent with moving men and material across the Arctic ice pack.

Further, few people know that the Arctic has enormous renewable resources, specifically, fish and other seafood, which represents one of the Nation's greatest commercial assets which will prove invaluable as a protein source in the 21st century. And while very little is known about Arctic's impact on our weather, there is an undeniably large impact on the world's weather attributable to the Arctic's cold air mass.

On another front—that of human health—the Arctic represents the only available laboratory for studying how man can adapt to a cold environment. While we have done studies in the Antarctic on how man adapts to a cold environment, man is foreign to the

Antarctic; he must be supported logistically from outside to meet his needs. In the Arctic, indigenous residents have lived for thousands of years, before outside logistics was possible. This legislation will allow a coherent study of these considerations and others for the first time, so as to allow the available research data on the Arctic to be available to future students of the world around us and how man can meet his needs without destroying his environment.

The need for this legislation is clear—most Arctic rim nations are far ahead of us in their study of the Arctic, and this area represents a frontier which demands our further investigation. The time is now for the Congress to enact legislation that will look forward to meeting our needs for all of the materials man will need to survive in the 21st century, and how to go about meeting those needs without destroying the area from which they will come.

The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, of which I am a member, altered the bill constructively to include some important considerations. Basically, their additions were threefold—first, that the bill allow for ice-breaking studies in the Arctic; second, that the combined logistical needs of the cooperating agencies would be effectively addressed; and third, that the institutional framework of the inter-agency team and the presidentially appointed Arctic Research Commission would be workable.

I am happy to say that working together, the Science and Technology Committee and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee were able to work out an outstanding resolution of these concerns—a resolution which is incorporated into this legislation.

This is a good piece of legislation—both titles are forward-looking realistic initiatives in tune with the future needs of this great Nation. We are presented today with an opportunity to respond to our critics who say that Congress has only a negative impact on life in these United States. Those who say that the last thing Congress did for energy security was passage of the Louisiana Purchase will be pleasantly surprised to know that with this measure today, we are laying the framework necessary to develop resources of the north so as to protect the fragile ecological balance that exists along with its tremendous energy and mineral resource base.

Further, those who concern themselves with the study of man's health will be pleased to know that we have broadened the legislation to encompass their concerns and the concerns of man in general in the bill. I urge my colleagues to join with the Members of the other body, who, led by Senator FRANK MURKOWSKI, have seen fit to

include this bill as part of their agenda for the future.

□ 1320

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

But before yielding back the balance, I would like to specially recognize the contributions that Mr. FUQUA in particular has made. I know that he is sorry he cannot be here today to be on the floor to manage this bill and to present it to the House.

Second, it is so clear that in the House Mr. YOUNG of Alaska is the driving force behind this legislation. Alaska is far away and many of us have never been there, and he deserves a tremendous amount of credit for being able to make the problems of Alaska real to the Members of the House and to get the attention of the relevant committees.

Mr. GREGG, on the Subcommittee on Science and Research and Technology deserves great credit for the sensitivity and the interest that he extended to this bill and we certainly on our committee as a whole, do appreciate the cooperation of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and all those involved on that side.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time, and yield back the balance of my time.

● Mr. McCURDY. I rise in strong support of title II, because I believe it will help this country form a coherent critical materials policy.

In 1981, I chaired a special panel on defense procurement procedures for the Armed Services Committee. During our hearings, one reality became painfully evident: our national stockpiles of strategic materials are insufficient. Our stockpiles are lacking in both quantity and quality, and so we must turn to other countries to meet our needs.

Over 90 percent of the chromium, cobalt, manganese, and platinum that our industries use in automotive and aerospace technologies come from foreign countries. Large amounts are imported from the often-volatile Third-World countries. Our reliance on these countries' materials has become too great. Procurement costs are being driven up, and our industries' ability to meet military and commercial needs is being slowed. This is bad economic policy and bad defense policy. Especially when you consider that the Soviet Union is largely self-sufficient in strategic materials.

Our dependence on other countries has made us vulnerable to supply interruptions and increased prices. The Critical Materials Council established in this bill will help us reverse this trend. It will provide a framework for experimenting with substitute ma-

terials, and aid in establishing a clear-cut stockpile program. It will help our industries to compete successfully with Japan and Europe in technical and scientific fields.

This bill is a step in the right direction, and I urge my colleagues to support it. ●

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology now printed in italic in the reported bill shall be considered by titles as an original bill for purpose of amendment, and each title shall be considered as having been read.

It shall be in order to consider an amendment to title I printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 9, 1984, by Representative FUQUA, if offered by Representative WALGREN, in lieu of the amendment to title I recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries printed in the bill, and said amendment shall be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

TITLE I—ARCTIC RESEARCH AND POLICY ACT OF 1983

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 101. That this title may be cited as the "Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1983".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 102. (a) The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the Arctic, onshore and offshore, contains vital energy resources that can reduce our dependence on foreign oil and improve the national balance of payments;

(2) as our only common border with the Soviet Union, the Arctic is critical to national defense;

(3) the renewable resources of the Arctic, specifically fish and other seafood, represent one of the Nation's greatest commercial assets;

(4) Arctic conditions directly affect global weather patterns and must be understood in order to promote better agricultural management throughout the United States;

(5) industrial pollution not originating in the Arctic region collects in the polar air mass, has the potential to disrupt global weather patterns, and must be controlled through international cooperation and consultation;

(6) the Arctic is a natural laboratory for research into human health and adaptation, physical and psychological, to climates of extreme cold and isolation and may provide information crucial for future defense needs;

(7) atmospheric conditions peculiar to the Arctic make the Arctic a unique testing ground for research into high latitude communications, which is likely to be crucial for future defense needs;

(8) Arctic marine technology is critical to cost-effective recovery and transportation of energy resources and to the national defense;

(9) most Arctic rim countries, particularly the Soviet Union, possess Arctic technologies far more advanced than those currently available in the United States;

(10) Federal Arctic research is fragmented and uncoordinated at the present time;

(11) such fragmentation has led to the neglect of certain areas of research and to unnecessary duplication of effort in other areas of research;

(12) there is an immediate need to formulate a comprehensive national policy and program plan to organize and fund currently neglected scientific research with respect to the Arctic;

(13) the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local governments, should focus its efforts on the collection and characterization of basic data related to biological, materials, and geophysical phenomena in the Arctic;

(14) research into the long range health, environmental, and social effects of development in the Arctic is necessary to mitigate the adverse consequence of such development to the land and its residents;

(15) Arctic research expands knowledge of the Arctic, which can enhance the lives of Arctic residents, increase opportunities for international cooperation among Arctic rim countries, and facilitate the formulation of national policy for the Arctic; and

(16) the Alaskan Arctic provides an essential habitat for marine mammals, migratory waterfowl, and other forms of wildlife which are important to the Nation and which are essential to Arctic residents.

(b) The purposes of this Act are

(1) to establish an Arctic Research Commission to promote Arctic research and to establish Arctic research policy;

(2) to establish an Office of Arctic Research within the National Science Foundation; and

(3) to establish priorities and provide a Federal program plan for basic and applied scientific research with respect to the Arctic, including (without being limited to) natural resources and materials, physical and biological sciences, and social and behavioral sciences.

ARCTIC RESEARCH COMMISSION

SEC. 103. (a) The President shall establish an Arctic Research Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b)(1) The Commission shall be composed of five members appointed by the President, with the Director of the National Science Foundation serving as a nonvoting, ex officio member. The members appointed by the President shall include—

(A) three members appointed from among individuals with expertise in areas of research relating to the Arctic (including, but not limited to, the physical, biological, health, and social sciences);

(B) one member appointed from among indigenous residents of the Arctic who are representative of the needs and interest of Arctic residents and who live in areas directly affected by Arctic resource development; and

(C) one member appointed from among individuals familiar with the Arctic and repre-

sentative of the needs and interests of private industry undertaking resource development in the Arctic.

(2) The President shall designate one of the appointed members of the Commission, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to be chairperson of the Commission.

(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the term of office of each member of the Commission appointed under subsection (b)(1) shall be four years.

(2) Of the members of the Commission originally appointed under subsection (b)(1)—

(A) two shall be appointed for a term of two years;

(B) two shall be appointed for a term of three years; and

(C) one shall be appointed for a term of four years.

(3) Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the Commission shall be filled, in the manner provided by the preceding provisions of this section, for the remainder of the unexpired term.

(4) A member may serve after the expiration of his term of office until the President appoints a successor.

(d)(1) A member of the Commission not otherwise employed by the United States shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the rate for grade GS-16 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, for each day such member is engaged in the actual performance of his duties as a member of the Commission.

(2) A member of the Commission who is an officer or employee of the United States or the State of Alaska shall serve without additional compensation.

(3) All members of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel (in accordance with section 5701 of title 5, United States Code) and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

(4) No member may be compensated for more than one hundred and thirty days of service each year in the performance of his or her duties as a member of the Commission.

DUTIES OF COMMISSION

SEC. 104. (a) The Commission shall—

(1) develop and establish an integrated national Arctic research policy;

(2) in cooperation with the Office of Arctic Research established under section 7, assist in establishing a national Arctic research program plan to implement the Arctic research policy;

(3) facilitate cooperation between the Federal Government and State and local governments with respect to Arctic research;

(4) coordinate and promote cooperative Arctic scientific research programs with other nations (subject to the foreign policy guidance of the Secretary of State);

(5) cooperate with the Governor of the State of Alaska and with such agencies and organizations of such State as the Governor may designate with respect to the formulation of Arctic research policy; and

(6) promote Federal interagency coordination of all relevant Arctic research activities.

(b) Not later than January 31 of each year, the Commission shall—

(1) publish a statement of goals and objectives with respect to Arctic research to guide the Office of Arctic Research in the performance of its duties; and

(2) submit to the President and to the Congress a report describing the activities and accomplishments of the Commission

during the immediately preceding fiscal year.

COOPERATION WITH THE COMMISSION

SEC. 105. (a)(1) The Commission may acquire from the head of any Federal agency unclassified data, reports, and other nonproprietary information with respect to Arctic research in the possession of the agency which the Commission considers useful in the discharge of its duties.

(2) Each such agency shall cooperate with the Commission and furnish all data, reports, and other information requested by the Commission to the extent permitted by law; except that no such agency need furnish any information which it is permitted to withhold under section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) With the consent of the appropriate agency head, the Commission may utilize the facilities and services of any Federal agency to the extent that such facilities and services are needed for the establishment and development of an Arctic research policy, upon such reimbursement as may be agreed upon by the Commission and the agency head and taking every feasible step to avoid duplication of effort.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 106. The Commission may—

(1) in accordance with civil service laws and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, appoint and fix the compensation of an Executive Director and such additional staff personnel as may be necessary, but not to exceed a total of seven compensated personnel;

(2) procure temporary and intermittent services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) enter into contracts and procure supplies, services, and personal property; and

(4) enter into agreements with the General Services Administration for the procurement of necessary financial and administrative services, for which payment shall be made by reimbursement from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Commission and the Administrator of the General Services Administration.

OFFICE OF ARCTIC RESEARCH

SEC. 107. (a) The Director of the National Science Foundation shall establish within the National Science Foundation an Office of Arctic Research (hereinafter referred to as the "Office").

(b) The Office shall—

(1) survey Arctic research conducted by Federal, State, and local agencies, the University of Alaska and other universities, and other private and public institutions to help to determine priorities for future Arctic research (including, without being limited to, natural resources and materials, physical and biological sciences, and social and behavioral sciences), and make recommendations thereon to the Commission and other interested parties;

(2) make grants for such Arctic research as may be necessary and desirable to further the goals and objectives of this Act, with special consideration being given to studies in neglected areas of Arctic research; and

(3) consult with the Commission with respect to—

(A) all ongoing and completed research programs and studies funded by the Office, (B) recommendations proposed by the Office with respect to future Arctic research, and

(C) guidelines for awarding and administering Arctic research grants.

(c)(1) Not later than January 31 of each year, the Office shall transmit to the Commission a report describing the activities and accomplishments of the Office during the immediately preceding calendar year and making recommendations with respect to future Arctic research policy.

(2) Such report shall be available for public inspection at reasonable times.

(d) The Office shall cooperate with the Governor of the State of Alaska, and with such agencies as the Governor may designate, with respect to—

(1) the recommendations made to the Commission pursuant to subsection (b)(1); and

(2) the logistical support of Arctic research and the storage, transfer, and dissemination of Arctic scientific and technological knowledge and data.

(e) All Federal agencies and departments with Arctic research programs shall work collaboratively with the Office in carrying out its responsibilities as required by this Act.

5-YEAR ARCTIC RESEARCH PLAN

SEC. 108. (a) The Director of the National Science Foundation, through the Office and in consultation with the Commission, the Governor of the State of Alaska, the residents of the Arctic, the private sector, public interest groups, and other appropriate Federal officials having authority over Arctic research programs, shall prepare a comprehensive 5-year program plan (hereinafter referred to as the "Plan") for the overall Federal effort in Arctic research. The Plan shall be prepared and submitted to the President for transmittal to the Congress within one year after the enactment of this Act and shall be revised biennially thereafter.

(b) The Plan shall contain but need not be limited to the following elements:

(1) an assessment of national needs and problems regarding the Arctic and the research necessary to address those needs or problems;

(2) a detailed listing of all existing Federal programs relating to Arctic research, including the existing goals, funding levels for each of the five following fiscal years, and the funds currently being expended to conduct such programs;

(3) recommendations for such program changes and other proposals as may be considered necessary to meet the requirements of the policy and goals as set forth by the Commission and in the Plan as currently in effect; and

(4) a description of the actions taken by the Director of the National Science Foundation and the Office to coordinate the budget review process in order to ensure interagency coordination and cooperation in (A) carrying out Federal Arctic research programs, and (B) eliminating unnecessary duplication of effort among such programs.

(c) The Office of Management and Budget shall consider all Federal agency requests for research related to the Arctic as one integrated, coherent, and multiagency request which shall be reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget prior to submission of the President's annual budget request for its adherence to the Plan. The Commission shall, after submission of the President's annual budget request, review the request and report to Congress on adherence to the Plan.

COORDINATION AND REVIEW OF BUDGET REQUESTS

SEC. 109. The Office of Science and Technology Policy shall—

(1) review all agency and department budget requests related to the Arctic transmitted under section 108(c) and reflect the intent of section 104(a)(1), 104(a)(2), 104(a)(4), and section 108(b)(3) of this Act, and

(2) consult with and seek the advice of the Commission to guide the Office of Science and Technology Policy's effort, keeping the Office, Commission, and the Congress advised of such efforts.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; NEW SPENDING AUTHORITY

SEC. 110. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for carrying out this Act.

(b) Any new spending authority (within the meaning of section 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) which is provided under this Act shall be effective for any fiscal year only to such extent or in such amounts as may be provided in appropriation Acts.

DEFINITION

SEC. 111. As used in this Act, the term "Arctic" means all United States and foreign territory north of the Arctic Circle and all United States territory north and west of the boundary formed by the Porcupine, Yukon, and Kuskokwim Rivers; all contiguous seas, including the Arctic Ocean and the Beaufort, Bering, and Chukchi Seas; and the Aleutian chain.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALGREN

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, I do offer the amendment that the Chair has referred to as made in order under the rule. The rule provides for the offering of this amendment which represents the agreement between the two committees involved, the Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

And I would plan to ask unanimous consent at a later point to insert a sectional analysis of this joint committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALGREN: Strike out title I (beginning on page 1, line 3, and ending on page 14, line 23) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE I—ARCTIC RESEARCH AND POLICY

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 102. (a) The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the Arctic, onshore and offshore, contains vital energy resources that can reduce the Nation's dependence on foreign oil and improve the national balance of payments;

(2) as the Nation's only common border with the Soviet Union, the Arctic is critical to national defense;

(3) the renewable resources of the Arctic, specifically fish and other seafood, represent one of the Nation's greatest commercial assets;

(4) Arctic conditions directly affect global weather patterns and must be understood in order to promote better agricultural management throughout the United States;

(5) industrial pollution not originating in the Arctic region collects in the polar air mass, has the potential to disrupt global weather patterns, and must be controlled through international cooperation and consultation;

(6) the Arctic is a natural laboratory for research into human health and adaptation, physical and psychological, to climates of extreme cold and isolation and may provide information crucial for future defense needs;

(7) atmospheric conditions peculiar to the Arctic make the Arctic a unique testing ground for research into high latitude communications, which is likely to be crucial for future defense needs;

(8) Arctic marine technology is critical to cost-effective recovery and transportation of energy resources and to the national defense;

(9) the United States has important security, economic, and environmental interests in developing and maintaining a fleet of ice-breaking vessels capable of operating effectively in the heavy ice regions of the Arctic;

(10) most Arctic-rim countries, particularly the Soviet Union, possess Arctic technologies far more advanced than those currently available in the United States;

(11) Federal Arctic research is fragmented and uncoordinated at the present time, leading to the neglect of certain areas of research and to unnecessary duplication of effort in other areas of research;

(12) improved logistical coordination and support for Arctic research and better dissemination of research data and information is necessary to increase the efficiency and utility of national Arctic research efforts;

(13) a comprehensive national policy and program plan to organize and fund currently neglected scientific research with respect to the Arctic is necessary to fulfill national objectives in Arctic research;

(14) the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local governments, should focus its efforts on the collection and characterization of basic data related to biological, materials, and geophysical phenomena in the Arctic;

(15) research into the long-range health, environmental, and social effects of development in the Arctic is necessary to mitigate the adverse consequences of that development to the land and its residents;

(16) Arctic research expands knowledge of the Arctic, which can enhance the lives of Arctic residents, increase opportunities for international cooperation among Arctic-rim countries, and facilitate the formulation of national policy for the Arctic; and

(17) the Alaskan Arctic provides an essential habitat for marine mammals, migratory waterfowl, and other forms of wildlife which are important to the Nation and which are essential to Arctic residents.

(b) The purposes of this title are—

(1) to establish national policy, priorities, and goals and to provide a Federal program plan for basic and applied scientific research with respect to the Arctic, including natural resources and materials, physical and biological sciences, and social and behavioral sciences;

(2) to establish an Arctic Research Commission to promote Arctic research and to recommend Arctic research policy;

(3) to designate the National Science Foundation as the lead agency responsible

for implementing Arctic research policy; and

(4) to establish an Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee to develop a national Arctic research policy and a five year plan to implement that policy.

ARCTIC RESEARCH COMMISSION

SEC. 103. (a) The President shall establish an Arctic Research Commission (hereafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b)(1) The Commission shall be composed of five members appointed by the President, with the Director of the National Science Foundation serving as a nonvoting ex officio member. The members appointed by the President shall include—

(A) three members appointed from among individuals from academic or other research institutions with expertise in areas of research relating to the Arctic, including the physical, biological, health, environmental, and social sciences;

(B) one member appointed from among indigenous residents of the Arctic who are representative of the needs and interests of Arctic residents and who live in areas directly affected by Arctic resource development; and

(C) one member appointed from among individuals familiar with the Arctic and representative of the needs and interests of private industry undertaking resource development in the Arctic.

(2) The President shall designate one of the appointed members of the Commission to be chairperson of the Commission.

(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the term of office of each member of the Commission appointed under subsection (b)(1) shall be four years.

(2) Of the members of the Commission originally appointed under subsection (b)(1)—

(A) one shall be appointed for a term of two years;

(B) two shall be appointed for a term of three years; and

(C) two shall be appointed for a term of four years.

(3) Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the Commission shall be filled, after notice of the vacancy is published in the Federal Register, in the manner provided by the preceding provisions of this section, for the remainder of the unexpired term.

(4) A member may serve after the expiration of the member's term of office until the President appoints a successor.

(5) A member may serve consecutive terms beyond the member's original appointment.

(d)(1) Members of the Commission may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code. Except for the purposes of chapter 81 of title 5 (relating to compensation for work injuries) and chapter 171 of title 28 (relating to tort claims), a member of the Commission shall not be considered an employee of the United States for any purpose.

(2) The Commission shall meet at the call of its Chairman or a majority of its members.

(3) Each Federal agency referred to in section 107(b) may designate a representative to participate as an observer with the Commission. These representatives shall report to and advise the Commission on the activities relating to Arctic research of their agencies.

(4) The Commission shall conduct at least one public meeting in the State of Alaska annually.

DUTIES OF COMMISSION

Sec. 104. (a) The Commission shall—

(1) develop and recommend an integrated national Arctic research policy;

(2) in cooperation with the Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee established under section 107, assist in establishing a national Arctic research program plan to implement the Arctic research policy;

(3) facilitate cooperation between the Federal Government and State and local governments with respect to Arctic research;

(4) review Federal research programs in the Arctic and suggest improvements in coordination among programs;

(5) recommend methods to improve logistical planning and support for Arctic research as may be appropriate and in accordance with the findings and purposes of this title;

(6) suggest methods for improving efficient sharing and dissemination of data and information on the Arctic among interested public and private institutions;

(7) offer other recommendations and advice to the Interagency Committee established under section 107 as it may find appropriate; and

(8) cooperate with the Governor of the State of Alaska and with agencies and organizations of that State which the Governor may designate with respect to the formulation of Arctic research policy.

(b) Not later than January 31 of each year, the Commission shall—

(1) publish a statement of goals and objectives with respect to Arctic research to guide the Interagency Committee established under section 107 in the performance of its duties; and

(2) submit to the President and to the Congress a report describing the activities and accomplishments of the Commission during the immediately preceding fiscal year.

COOPERATION WITH THE COMMISSION

Sec. 105. (a)(1) The Commission may acquire from the head of any Federal agency unclassified data, reports, and other nonproprietary information with respect to Arctic research in the possession of the agency which the Commission considers useful in the discharge of its duties.

(2) Each agency shall cooperate with the Commission and furnish all data, reports, and other information requested by the Commission to the extent permitted by law; except that no agency need furnish any information which it is permitted to withhold under section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) With the consent of the appropriate agency head, the Commission may utilize the facilities and services of any Federal agency to the extent that the facilities and services are needed for the establishment and development of an Arctic research policy, upon reimbursement to be agreed upon by the Commission and the agency head and taking every feasible step to avoid duplication of effort.

(c) All Federal agencies shall consult with the Commission before undertaking major Federal actions relating to Arctic research.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 106. The Commission may—

(1) in accordance with the civil service laws and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, appoint and fix the compensation of an Executive Director and necessary additional staff personnel, but not to exceed a total of seven compensated personnel;

(2) procure temporary and intermittent services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) enter into contracts and procure supplies, services, and personal property; and

(4) enter into agreements with the General Services Administration for the procurement of necessary financial and administrative services, for which payment shall be made by reimbursement from funds of the Commission in amounts to be agreed upon by the Commission and the Administrator of the General Services Administration.

LEAD AGENCY AND INTERAGENCY ARCTIC RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE

Sec. 107. (a) The National Science Foundation is designated as the lead agency responsible for implementing Arctic research policy, and the Director of the National Science Foundation shall insure that the requirements of section 108 are fulfilled.

(b)(1) The President shall establish an Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee (hereinafter referred to as the "Interagency Committee").

(2) The Interagency Committee shall be composed of representatives of the following Federal agencies or offices:

- (A) the National Science Foundation;
- (B) the Department of Commerce;
- (C) the Department of Defense;
- (D) the Department of Energy;
- (E) the Department of the Interior;
- (F) the Department of State;
- (G) the Department of Transportation;
- (H) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(I) the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(J) any other agency or office deemed appropriate.

(3) The representative of the National Science Foundation shall serve as the Chairperson of the Interagency Committee.

DUTIES OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

Sec. 108. (a) The Interagency Committee shall—

(1) survey Arctic research conducted by Federal, State, and local agencies, universities, and other public and private institutions to help determine priorities for future Arctic research, including natural resources and materials, physical and biological sciences, and social and behavioral sciences;

(2) work with the Commission to develop and establish an integrated national Arctic research policy that will guide Federal agencies in developing and implementing their research programs in the Arctic;

(3) consult with the Commission on—

(A) the development of the national Arctic research policy and the 5-year plan implementing the policy;

(B) Arctic research programs of Federal agencies;

(C) recommendations of the Commission on future Arctic research; and

(D) guidelines for Federal agencies for awarding and administering Arctic research grants;

(4) develop a 5-year plan to implement the national policy, as provided for in section 109;

(5) provide the necessary coordination, data, and assistance for the preparation of a single integrated, coherent, and multiagency budget request for Arctic research as provided for in section 110;

(6) facilitate cooperation between the Federal Government and State and local governments in Arctic research, and recommend the undertaking of neglected areas of research in accordance with the findings and purposes of this title;

(7) coordinate and promote cooperative Arctic scientific research programs with other nations, subject to the foreign policy guidance of the Secretary of State;

(8) cooperate with the Governor of the State of Alaska in fulfilling its responsibilities under this title;

(9) promote Federal interagency coordination of all Arctic research activities, including—

(A) logistical planning and coordination; and

(B) the sharing of data and information associated with Arctic research, subject to section 552 of title 5, United States Code; and

(10) provide public notice of its meetings and an opportunity for the public to participate in the development and implementation of national Arctic research policy.

(b) Not later than January 31, 1986, and biennially thereafter, the Interagency Committee shall submit to the President and the Congress a brief, concise report containing—

(1) a statement of the activities and accomplishments of the Interagency Committee since its last report; and

(2) a description of the activities of the Commission, detailing with particularity the recommendations of the Commission with respect to Federal activities in Arctic research.

5-YEAR ARCTIC RESEARCH PLAN

Sec. 109. (a) The Interagency Committee, in consultation with the Commission, the Governor of the State of Alaska, the residents of the Arctic, the private sector, and public interest groups, shall prepare a comprehensive 5-year program plan (hereinafter referred to as the "Plan") for the overall Federal effort in Arctic research. The Plan shall be prepared and submitted to the President for transmittal to the Congress within one year after the enactment of this Act and shall be revised biennially thereafter.

(b) The Plan shall contain but need not be limited to the following elements:

(1) an assessment of national needs and problems regarding the Arctic and the research necessary to address those needs or problems;

(2) a statement of the goals and objectives of the Interagency Committee for national Arctic research;

(3) a detailed listing of all existing Federal programs relating to Arctic research, including the existing goals, funding levels for each of the 5 following fiscal years, and the funds currently being expended to conduct the programs;

(4) recommendations for necessary program changes and other proposals to meet the requirements of the policy and goals as set forth by the Commission and in the Plan as currently in effect; and

(5) a description of the actions taken by the Interagency Committee to coordinate the budget review process in order to ensure interagency coordination and cooperation in (A) carrying out Federal Arctic research programs, and (B) eliminating unnecessary duplication of effort among these programs.

COORDINATION AND REVIEW OF BUDGET REQUESTS

Sec. 110. (a) The Office of Science and Technology Policy shall—

(1) review all agency and department budget requests related to the Arctic transmitted pursuant to section 108(a)(5), in accordance with the national Arctic research policy and the 5-year program under section 108(a)(2) and section 109, respectively; and

(2) consult closely with the Interagency Committee and the Commission to guide the Office of Science and Technology Policy's efforts.

(b)(1) The Office of Management and Budget shall consider all Federal agency requests for research related to the Arctic as one integrated, coherent, and multiagency request which shall be reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget prior to submission of the President's annual budget request for its adherence to the Plan. The Commission shall, after submission of the President's annual budget request, review the request and report to Congress on adherence to the Plan.

(2) The Office of Management and Budget shall seek to facilitate planning for the design, procurement, maintenance, deployment, and operations of icebreakers needed to provide a platform for Arctic research by allocating all funds necessary to support icebreaking operations, except for recurring incremental costs associated with specific projects, to the Coast Guard.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; NEW SPENDING AUTHORITY

SEC. 111. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for carrying out this title.

(b) Any new spending authority (within the meaning of section 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) which is provided under this title shall be effective for any fiscal year only to such extent or in such amounts as may be provided in appropriation Acts.

DEFINITION

SEC. 112. As used in this title, the term "Arctic" means all United States and foreign territory north of the Arctic Circle and all United States territory north and west of the boundary formed by the Porcupine, Yukon, and Kuskokwim Rivers; all contiguous seas, including the Arctic Ocean and the Beaufort, Bering, and Chukchi Seas; and the Aleutian chain.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALGREN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the chairman of the full Committee on Science and Technology, we ask that the Members of the House do support this amendment. It represents the full agreement reached between the chairman of the committee ironing out differences between them.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that before this amendment is adopted the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) has an amendment that he will offer.

Mr. Chairman, the section-by-section analysis to which I referred earlier is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF JOINT COMMITTEE COMPROMISE TO TITLE I OF S. 373

This section-by-section analysis describes changes to Title I of S. 373 as proposed by the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Congressman Doug Walgren, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, on behalf of the Committees on Science and Technology and Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Additional explanations of other provisions in Title I may be found in the reports issued by the Committee on Science and Technology (Report No. 98-593, Part I)

and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries (Report No. 98-593, Part II).

SECTION 101

Section 101 replaces "1983" with "1984" to correspond with the year of enactment.

SECTION 102

Subsection (a) of this section specifies, without change, the findings for title I that were reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Subsection (b) adds a new paragraph 3 to the purposes of the title designating the National Science Foundation (NSF) as the lead agency for implementing Arctic research policy. The Committees believe that the NSF represents the most appropriate Federal entity to carry out the Arctic research directives of this title. In designating the NSF as the lead agency and in establishing it as the Chair of the Interagency Committee, the Committees intend that the NSF assume the lead role in ensuring that the mandate for the Interagency Committee is properly and fully implemented. The amendment also adopts certain minor technical and conforming changes to subsection (b).

SECTION 103

Subsection (b)(1)(A) of the amendment adds expertise in environmental sciences as an additional criterion for qualifying individuals from research institutions for appointment to the Commission. The Committees proposed this change to ensure that this type of expertise may be represented on the Commission. Title I, as reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, had called for two members to be drawn from public interest organizations so that an appropriate balance of industrial, environmental, and regional perspectives would be represented on the Commission. In proposing this amendment, the Committees recognize the desirability of a smaller five-member commission, but propose the additional criterion in paragraph (A) to ensure a proper balance of perspectives on the Commission.

The amendment alters in subsection (C)(2) the staggering of terms of appointment as originally proposed by the Committee on Science and Technology. By specifying that two members shall be appointed for four years and one member for two years, rather than the reverse, the amendment will achieve the overall objective of staggered terms but ensure greater stability in the initial appointments.

Paragraphs 5 of subsection (c) specifies that a member may serve consecutive terms beyond the member's original appointment. This additional provision is intended by the Committees to increase the opportunity for stability and continuity of membership on the Commission, where appropriate.

SECTION 104

Section 104(a) specifies the duties of the Commission. As compared with Section 104 as reported by the Committee on Science and Technology, this amendment makes clear in paragraph one that the Commission is to recommend national Arctic research policy to the Interagency Committee, but that primary responsibility for developing that policy lies with the Interagency Committee.

Paragraph 2 makes clear that the Commission is to assist the Interagency Committee in establishing the National Arctic Research Program plan implementing Arctic research policy. Although Title I rests primary responsibility for the plan with the

Interagency Committee, the Committees intend by paragraph 2 to preserve a meaningful consultative role for the Commission.

Paragraphs 4 through 7 are drawn from Section 103(d) as reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and contain additional broad authority for the Commission to review Federal research programs and make recommendations to the Interagency Committee on those programs.

SECTION 105

Section 105 remains largely unchanged from the section as reported by the Committee on Science and Technology, but for the addition of subsection (c). Subsection (c), drawn from section 103(c)(5) as reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, specifies that Federal agencies must consult with the Commission before undertaking major Federal actions relating to Arctic research. The Committees intend that subsection (c) insure that the Commission is fully informed of all significant Federal actions relating to Arctic research. The Committees believe that this consultation requirement will promote the effectiveness of the Commission in reviewing and making recommendations on Federal research activities. It is not intended that the Commission have the authority to veto major research programs nor to impede the efficient implementation of these programs.

SECTION 106

Section 106 is drawn from the corresponding section in Title I, as reported by the Commission on Science and Technology.

SECTION 107

Section 107 specifies the National Science Foundation as the lead agency for implementing Arctic research policy and for ensuring that the duties of the Interagency Committee are fulfilled. The purpose of so designating the NSF is to vest overall responsibility for the Interagency Committee within a single agency to which the Congress may look for proper implementation of this title.

Subsection (b), drawn from section 104 as reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, establishes an Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee, and specifies the NSF as chairperson of the Interagency Committee. Upon careful deliberations, the Committees have concluded that the experience and independence of the NSF best qualify it for chairperson of the Interagency Committee.

SECTION 108

Section 108, drawn largely from Section 105 as reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, includes a new paragraph 5 which directs the Interagency Committee to provide the necessary assistance to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in developing multi-agency budget requests under Section 110. The purpose of paragraph 5 is to ensure that the Committee is intimately involved with OMB in developing Federal Arctic research budget proposals. By this involvement, OMB will benefit from the broadly based expertise of the Interagency Committee, and will thereby develop a more closely coordinated and effective budget proposal for Federal Arctic research.

The reporting requirements in subsection (b) omit a requirement for a statement on the goals and objectives of the Interagency Committee, as recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, since those goals and objectives will be adequately articulated by the five-year Arctic

research plan. The report is, therefore, to constitute a concise review of the activities of the Interagency Committee and the Arctic Research Policy Commission.

SECTION 109

Section 109 proposes a five-year arctic research plan similar to the versions reported by both Committees. The timing of the first plan is modified to coincide with the yearly report of the Commission under section 104(b). Paragraph (2) of subsection (b), requiring a statement of the goals and objectives of the Interagency Committee, had been a part of the Committee's biennial report. The amendment relocates it in the five year plan since it more properly constitutes an integral component of the plan. Additional technical and conforming changes are also proposed.

SECTION 110

Section 110, consolidating the budgetary coordination requirements of title I, is drawn from Section 109 as reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, with technical and conforming changes to the references to other sections of title I.

SECTIONS 111 AND 112

Sections 111 and 112 remain unchanged from sections 110 and 111, as reported by the Committee on Science and Technology.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GREGG TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALGREN

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREGG to the amendment offered by Mr. WALGREN: Under Section 102(a)(14), delete the words "and geophysical" and insert in lieu thereof "geophysical, social, and behavioral".

Under Section 103(b)(1)(A), delete the following "and social sciences;" and insert in lieu thereof "social and behavioral sciences;"

Under Section 108(b), delete the words "President and" and insert after the word "Congress" the words "through the President".

Mr. GREGG (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment has been reviewed by the majority; they have no problems. It involves technical changes to the language of the bill.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise to speak in favor of the amendment. This is a technical amendment, as the gentleman has represented, and simply provides for consistency in reference to social and behavioral sciences in the structure when the report by the President is made to the Congress.

I would ask support for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) to the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALGREN).

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALGREN) as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

TITLE II—NATIONAL CRITICAL MATERIALS ACT OF 1983

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "National Critical Materials Act of 1983".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 202. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the availability of adequate supplies of strategic and critical industrial minerals and materials continues to be essential for national security, economic well-being, and industrial production;

(2) the United States is increasingly dependent on foreign sources of materials and vulnerable to supply interruption in the case of many of those minerals and materials essential to the Nation's defense and economic well-being;

(3) together with increasing import dependence, the Nation's industrial base, including the capacity to process minerals and materials, is deteriorating—both in terms of facilities and in terms of a trained labor force;

(4) research, development, and technological innovation, especially related to improved materials and new processing technologies, are important factors which affect our long-term capability for economic competitiveness, as well as for adjustment to interruptions in supply of critical minerals and materials;

(5) while other nations have developed and implemented specific long-term research and technology programs to develop high-performance materials, no such policy and program evolution has occurred in the United States;

(6) establishing critical materials reserves, by both the public and private sectors and with proper organization and management, represents one means of responding to the genuine risks to our economy and national defense from dependency on foreign sources;

(7) there exists no single Federal entity with the authority and responsibility for establishing critical materials policy and for coordinating and implementing that policy; and

(8) the importance of materials to national goals requires an organizational means for establishing responsibilities for materials programs and for the coordination, within and at a suitably high level of the Executive Office of the President, with other existing policies within the Federal Government.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act—

(1) to establish a National Critical Materials Council under and reporting to the Executive Office of the President which shall—

(A) establish responsibilities for and provide for necessary coordination of critical materials policies, including all facets of re-

search and technology, among the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government, and provide for the implementation of such policies;

(B) bring to the attention of the President, the Congress, and the general public such materials issues and concerns, including research and development, as are deemed critical to the economic and strategic health of the Nation; and

(C) ensure adequate and continuing consultation with the private sector concerning critical materials, materials research and development, use of materials, Federal materials policies, and related matters;

(2) to establish a national Federal program for advanced materials research and technology, including basic phenomena through processing and manufacturing technology; and

(3) to stimulate innovation and technology utilization in basic as well as advanced materials industries.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL CRITICAL MATERIALS COUNCIL

SEC. 203. There is hereby established a National Critical Materials Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") under and reporting to the Executive Office of the President. The Council shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President and who shall serve at the pleasure of the President. Members so appointed who are not already Senate-confirmed officers of the Government shall be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate one of the members to serve as Chairman. Each member shall be a person who, as a result of training, experience, and achievement, is qualified to carry out the duties and functions of the Council, with particular emphasis placed on fields relating to materials policy or materials science and engineering. In addition, at least one of the members shall have a background in and understanding of environmentally related issues.

RESPONSIBILITIES AND AUTHORITIES OF THE COUNCIL

SEC. 204. (a) It shall be the primary responsibility of the Council—

(1) to assist and advise the President in establishing coherent national materials policies consistent with other Federal policies, and in carrying out activities necessary to implement such policies;

(2) to assist in establishing responsibilities for, and to coordinate, Federal materials-related policies, programs, and research and technology activities, as well as recommending to the Office of Management and Budget, budget priorities for materials activities in each of the Federal departments and agencies;

(3) to review and appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in accordance with the policy and directions given in the National Materials and Minerals Policy, Research and Development Act of 1980 (30 U.S.C. 1601), and to determine the extent to which such programs and activities are contributing to the achievement of such policy and directions;

(4) to monitor and evaluate the critical materials needs of basic and advanced technology industries and the Government, including the critical materials research and development needs of the private and public sectors;

(5) to advise the President of mineral and material trends, both domestic and foreign, the implications thereof for the United

States and world economies and the national security, and the probable effects of such trends on domestic industries:

(6) to assess through consultation with the materials academic community the adequacy and quality of materials-related educational institutions and the supply of materials scientists and engineers;

(7) to make or furnish such studies, analyses, reports, and recommendations with respect to matters of materials-related policy and legislation as the President may request;

(8)(A) to prepare a report providing a domestic inventory of critical materials with projections on the prospective needs of Government and industry for these materials, including a long-range assessment, prepared in conjunction with the Office of Science and Technology Policy in accordance with the National Materials and Minerals Policy, Research and Development Act of 1980, and in conjunction with such other Government departments or agencies as may be considered necessary, of the prospective major critical materials problems which the United States is likely to confront in the immediate years ahead and providing advice as to how these problems may best be addressed, with the first such report being due on April 1, 1985 and (B) review and update such report and assessment as appropriate and report thereon to the Congress at least biennially; and

(9) to recommend to the Congress such changes in current policies, activities, and regulations of the Federal Government, and such legislation, as may be considered necessary to carry out the intent of this Act and the National Materials and Minerals Policy, Research and Development Act of 1980.

(b) In carrying out its responsibilities under this section the Council shall have the authority—

(1) to establish such special advisory panels as it considers necessary, with each such panel consisting of representatives of industry, academia, and other members of the private sector, not to exceed ten members, and being limited in scope of subject and duration; and

(2) to establish and convene such Federal interagency committees as it considers necessary in carrying out the intent of this Act.

(c) In seeking to achieve the goals of this and related Acts, the Council and other Federal departments and agencies with responsibilities or jurisdiction related to materials or materials policy, including the National Security Council, the Council on Environmental Quality, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Office of Science and Technology Policy, shall work collaboratively and in close cooperation.

PROGRAM AND POLICY FOR ADVANCED MATERIALS RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

SEC. 205. (a) In addition to the responsibilities described in section 204, the Council shall have specific responsibility for overseeing and collaborating with appropriate agencies and departments of the Federal Government relative to Federal materials research and development policies and programs. Such policies and programs shall be consistent with the policies and goals described in the National Materials and Minerals Policy, Research and Development Act of 1980. In carrying out this responsibility the Council shall—

(1)(A) establish a national Federal program plan for advanced materials research and development, designating the key responsibilities for carrying out such research and providing for coordination with the

Office of Science and Technology Policy, the Office of Management and Budget, and such other Federal offices and agencies as may be deemed appropriate, and (B) annually receive such plan and report thereon to the Congress;

(2) review annually the materials research, development, and technology authorization requests and budgets of all Federal agencies and departments; and in this activity the Council shall, in cooperation with the Office of Science and Technology Policy, the Office of Management and Budget, and all other Federal offices and agencies deemed appropriate, ensure close coordination of the goals and directions of such programs with the policies determined by the Council; and

(3) assist the Office of Science and Technology Policy in the preparation of such long-range materials assessments and reports as may be required by the National Materials and Minerals Policy, Research and Development Act of 1980, and assist other Federal entities in the preparation of analyses and reporting relating to critical and advanced materials.

(b) The Office of Management and Budget, in reviewing the materials research, development, and technology authorization requests of the various Federal departments and agencies for any fiscal year, shall consider all of such requests as an integrated, coherent, multiagency request which shall be reviewed by the Council and the Office of Management and Budget for its adherence to the national Federal materials program plan in effect for such fiscal year under subsection (a).

INNOVATION IN BASIC AND ADVANCED MATERIALS INDUSTRIES

SEC. 206. (a)(1) In order to promote the use of more cost-effective, advanced technology and other means of providing for innovation and increased productivity within the basic and advanced materials industries, the Council shall evaluate and make recommendations regarding the establishment of Centers for Industrial Technology as provided in Public Law 96-480 (15 U.S.C. 3705).

(2) The activities of such Centers shall focus on, but not be limited to, the following generic materials areas: corrosion; welding and joining of materials; advanced processing and fabrication technologies, micro-fabrication; and fracture and fatigue.

(b) In order to promote better use and innovation of materials in design for improved safety or efficiency, the Council shall establish in cooperation with the appropriate Federal agencies and private industry, an effective mechanism for disseminating materials property data in an efficient and timely manner. In carrying out this responsibility, the Council shall consider, where appropriate, the establishment of a computerized system taking into account, to the maximum extent practicable, existing available resources.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS AND REIMBURSEMENTS

SEC. 207. (a) The Chairman of the Council, if not otherwise a paid officer or employee of the Federal Government, shall be paid at the rate not to exceed the rate of basic pay provided for level II of the Executive Schedule. The other members of the Council, if not otherwise paid officers or employees of the Federal Government, shall be paid at a per diem rate comparable to the rate not to exceed the rate of basic pay provided for level III of the Executive Schedule.

(b) The Council may accept reimbursement from any private nonprofit organization or from any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government, or from any State or local government, for reasonable travel expenses incurred by any member or employee of the Council in connection with such member's or employee's attendance at any conference, seminar, or similar meeting.

POSITION AND AUTHORITIES OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SEC. 208. (a) There shall be an Executive Director (hereinafter referred to as the "Director"), who shall be chief administrator of the Council. The Director shall be appointed by the Council full time and shall be paid at the rate not to exceed the rate of basic pay provided for level III of the Executive Schedule.

(b) The Director is authorized—

(1) to employ such personnel as may be necessary for the Council to carry out its duties and functions under this Act, but not to exceed twelve compensated employees;

(2) to obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; and

(3) to develop, subject to approval by the Council, rules and regulations necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) In exercising his responsibilities and duties under this Act, the Director—

(1) may consult with representatives of academia, industry, labor, State and local governments, and other groups; and

(2) shall utilize to the fullest extent possible the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals.

(d) Notwithstanding section 367(b) of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665(b)), the Council may utilize voluntary and uncompensated labor and services in carrying out its duties and functions.

RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES OF THE DIRECTOR

SEC. 209. In carrying out his functions the Director shall assist and advise the Council on policies and programs of the Federal Government affecting critical and advanced materials by—

(1) providing the professional and administrative staff and support for the Council;

(2) assisting the Federal agencies and departments in appraising the effectiveness of existing and proposed facilities, programs, policies, and activities of the Federal Government, including research and development, which affect critical materials availability and needs;

(3) cataloging, as fully as possible, research and development activities of the Government, private industry, and public and private institutions; and

(4) initiating Government and private studies and analyses, including those to be conducted by or under the auspices of the Council, designed to advance knowledge of critical or advanced materials issues and develop alternative proposals, including research and development, to resolve national critical materials problems.

AUTHORITY

SEC. 210. The Council is authorized—

(1) to establish such internal rules and regulations as may be necessary for its operation;

(2) to enter into contracts and acquire property necessary for its operation to such

extent or in such amounts as are provided for in appropriation Act;

(3) to publish or arrange to publish critical materials information that it deems to be useful to the public and private industry to the extent that such publication is consistent with the national defense and economic interest; and

(4) to exercise such authorities as may be necessary and incidental to carrying out its responsibilities and duties under this Act.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 211. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act a sum not to exceed \$500,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and such sums as may be necessary thereafter.

DEFINITION

SEC. 212. As used in this Act, the term "materials" has the meaning given it by section 2(b) of the National Materials and Minerals Policy, Research and Development Act of 1980.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. WALGREN

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, I offer technical amendments to title II. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. WALGREN: Page 32, line 22, strike out "1983" and insert "1984".

Page 32, line 25, strike out "1983" and insert "1984".

Page 34, line 18, strike out "Act" and insert "title".

Page 38, line 23, strike out "Act" and insert "title".

Page 39, line 10, strike out "Act" and insert "title".

Page 39, line 11, insert "title" after "this".

Page 43, line 14, lines 21, and 23 strike out "Act" and insert "title".

Page 45, line 24, strike out "Act" and insert "title".

Page 46, lines 3, and 7, strike out "Act" and insert "title".

Mr. WALGREN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the amendments be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, these are purely technical amendments, making conforming changes with respect to the page numbers and dates. I am sure it would meet with the approval of the Committee.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALGREN).

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title II?

Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TORRICELLI) having assumed the chair, Mr. MATSUI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the Senate bill (S. 373) to provide comprehensive national policy dealing with national needs and objectives in the Arctic, pursuant to House Resolution 482, he reported the Senate bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the Senate bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 253, nays 1, answered "present" 1, not voting 178, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

YEAS—253

Akaka	Byron	Duncan
Alexander	Carney	Early
Anderson	Carper	Eckart
Andrews (TX)	Carr	Edgar
Applegate	Chandler	Edwards (CA)
Archer	Chapple	Edwards (OK)
Badham	Clarke	Emerson
Barnes	Clay	English
Bartlett	Coleman (MO)	Erdreich
Bates	Coleman (TX)	Erlenborn
Beilenson	Conable	Evans (IA)
Bennett	Conyers	Evans (IL)
Berman	Cooper	Fascell
Bethune	Corcoran	Fazio
Biaggi	Coughlin	Feighan
Boehlert	Courter	Fiedler
Boland	Craig	Fields
Bonior	Crockett	Fish
Borski	D'Amours	Florio
Boucher	Daniel	Ford (MI)
Brooks	Dannemeyer	Ford (TN)
Brown (CA)	de la Garza	Frank
Brown (CO)	Dickinson	Frenzel
Broyhill	Downey	Gekas
Bryant	Dreier	Gibbons

Gilman	Madigan	Shumway
Gingrich	Martin (NY)	Shuster
Gonzalez	Martinez	Sikorski
Goodling	Matsui	Simon
Gradison	Mazzoli	Sisisky
Gramm	McCollum	Skeen
Gray	McCurdy	Slattery
Green	McEwen	Smith (FL)
Gregg	McKernan	Smith (NE)
Gunderson	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Hall (OH)	Michel	Smith, Denny
Hall, Ralph	Mineta	Smith, Robert
Hall, Sam	Mitchell	Snowe
Hamilton	Moakley	Solarz
Hammerschmidt	Molinar	Solomon
Hansen (UT)	Montgomery	Spence
Harkin	Moore	Spratt
Harrison	Moorhead	Staggers
Hartnett	Morrison (WA)	Stangeland
Hawkins	Mrazek	Stratton
Hayes	Murtha	Sundquist
Hefner	Natcher	Synar
Hertel	Neal	Tauke
Hiler	Nichols	Taylor
Hillis	Nielson	Thomas (CA)
Holt	O'Brien	Thomas (GA)
Hopkins	Oberstar	Torres
Howard	Obey	Torricelli
Hoyer	Olin	Traxler
Hubbard	Owens	Udall
Huckaby	Oxley	Vander Jagt
Hughes	Packard	Vento
Hunter	Parris	Volkmer
Hutto	Pashayan	Walgren
Hyde	Pease	Walker
Jacobs	Penny	Watkins
Jeffords	Pepper	Waxman
Kasich	Perkins	Wheat
Kastenmeier	Petri	Whitehurst
Kemp	Porter	Whitley
Kildee	Price	Whittaker
Kolter	Pritchard	Whitten
Kramer	Rahall	Williams (MT)
Lagomarsino	Ratchford	Williams (OH)
Leath	Ray	Winn
Lent	Regula	Wirth
Levin	Rinaldo	Wise
Levine	Roberts	Wolf
Levit	Roemer	Wolpe
Lewis (CA)	Rose	Wortley
Livingston	Roth	Wright
Loeffler	Roukema	Wyden
Lott	Rudd	Wylie
Lowery (CA)	Sabo	Yates
Lowry (WA)	Savage	Young (AK)
Lujan	Schaefer	Young (FL)
Lundine	Sensenbrenner	Young (MO)
Lungren	Sharp	Zschau
Mack	Shaw	
MacKay	Shelby	

NAYS—1

Crane, Philip

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Richardson

NOT VOTING—178

Ackerman	Cheney	Filippo
Addabbo	Clinger	Foglietta
Albosta	Coats	Foley
Andrews (NC)	Coelho	Fowler
Annunzio	Collins	Franklin
Anthony	Conte	Frost
Aspin	Coyne	Fuqua
AuCoin	Crane, Daniel	Garcia
Barnard	Darden	Gaydos
Bateman	Daschle	Gejdenson
Bedell	Daub	Gephardt
Bereuter	Davis	Glickman
Bevill	Dellums	Gore
Billakis	Derrick	Guarini
Bliley	DeWine	Hall (IN)
Boggs	Dicks	Hance
Boner	Dingell	Hansen (ID)
Bonker	Dixon	Hatcher
Bosco	Donnelly	Heftel
Boxer	Dorgan	Hightower
Breaux	Dowdy	Horton
Britt	Durbin	Ireland
Broomfield	Dwyer	Jenkins
Burton (CA)	Dymally	Johnson
Burton (IN)	Dyson	Jones (NC)
Campbell	Edwards (AL)	Jones (OK)
Chappell	Ferraro	Jones (TN)

Kaptur	McNulty	Russo
Kazen	Mikulski	Sawyer
Kennelly	Miller (CA)	Scheuer
Kindness	Miller (OH)	Schneider
Klecza	Minish	Schroeder
Kogovsek	Mollohan	Schulze
Kostmayer	Moody	Schumer
LaFalce	Morrison (CT)	Seiberling
Lantos	Murphy	Shannon
Latta	Myers	Siljander
Leach	Nelson	Skelton
Lehman (CA)	Nowak	Smith (IA)
Lehman (FL)	Oakar	Snyder
Leland	Ortiz	St Germain
Lewis (FL)	Ottinger	Stark
Lipinski	Panetta	Stenholm
Lloyd	Patman	Stokes
Long (LA)	Patterson	Studds
Long (MD)	Paul	Stump
Luken	Pickle	Swift
Markey	Pursell	Tallon
Marlenee	Quillen	Tauzin
Marriott	Rangel	Towns
Martin (IL)	Reid	Valentine
Martin (NC)	Ridge	Vandergriff
Mavroules	Ritter	Vucanovich
McCaIn	Robinson	Weaver
McCandless	Rodino	Weber
McCloskey	Roe	Weiss
McDade	Rogers	Wilson
McGrath	Rostenkowski	Yatron
McHugh	Rowland	
McKinney	Roybal	

□ 1340

Mr. HUNTER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the Senate bill was amended so as to read: "An Act to provide for a comprehensive national policy dealing with national research needs and objectives in the Arctic, for a National Critical Materials Council, for development of a continuing and comprehensive national materials policy, for programs necessary to carry out that policy, including Federal programs of advanced materials research and technology, and for innovation in basic materials industries and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter, on the Senate bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

□ 1350

ARMENIAN MARTYRS' DAY

Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California, Mr. PASHAYAN, is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 69th anniversary of the first genocide of the 20th century. The first—and to the world's horror not the last—time a nation-state decided

to solve a minority question by attempting to eliminate a minority population. Sixty-nine years ago today, the Young Turk Government of the Ottoman Empire exiled or murdered some 200 Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders of Constantinople. Thus began the government-conceived systematic massacre of some 1½ million Armenian men, women, and children, and the destruction of their civilization of 2,500 years and the banishment from their historic homeland in the Anatolian Plateau.

For the past 15 years, this body has set aside a special day to commemorate Armenian Martyrs' Day and it is once again my privilege to reserve this time so that we might pause to remember this tenacious people and the tragedy that befell them. By accurately remembering and truly comprehending such crimes against humanity, it is my fervent hope that we shall one day prevent forever for all peoples the horrors visited upon the Armenian people.

I must observe, with considerable regret and increasing dismay, that the Republic of Turkey continues to deny the undeniable—that a predecessor Turkish Government planned and committed this heinous crime. In order for the world to learn from the Armenian calamity, it is of critical importance that the Republic of Turkey recognize the act. I repeat my closing remarks during last year's commemoration. "Great history can hardly be made by expunging past history, or by attempting to expunge it. I offer to the Government of Turkey, I extend the hand of diplomacy. Let us conduct discussions with a view to resolving this issue, now too long unsettled. It is now for us, the successors on both sides of these terrible events, to settle once and for all this issue that needlessly pulls us apart. Let us talk."

Mr. Speaker, let us recall for a moment the Republic of Turkey's response to this call for dialog, built upon an acceptance of the historical record. Instead of dialog, the Republic of Turkey has intensified its campaign of denial throughout this nation. I wish at this time to share with this body the Turkish response. On May 18, 1983, Sukru Elekdag, Ambassador of the Turkish Republic to the United States, wrote to the Members who participated in last year's commemoration expressing his government's "... great disappointment." The entire text of the Ambassador's letter follows:

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: I read your statement in the Congressional Record (April 21) with great disappointment.

That tragedies befell Turks, Armenians and other ethnic groups in the Ottoman Empire during World War I is beyond dispute. Unfortunately, whoever it was that prevailed upon you to embrace the one-sided distortions of history that currently are grist for an escalating campaign of defa-

mation, intimidation, and violence aimed at all things Turkish, has done you a grave disservice.

No reliable evidence exists to justify the allegation that the Ottoman Empire, fighting for its survival in World War I, either planned or carried out a systematic massacre of its Armenian population. The Ottoman state in 1915 was the scene of a civil war within a global war—the civil war stemming from an armed uprising of Armenians seeking to impose establishment of an exclusively Armenian state in an area that was predominantly non-Armenian. Ensuing hostilities, famine and epidemics claimed Armenian and Turkish lives; more than 2 million Turks perished during the same period.

I was also deeply disappointed that your concern seems to be highly selective, excluding Turkish casualties and implying you hold Turkish lives of little importance. This selectivity apparently persists to the present day. You must be aware of the fact that 26 Turkish diplomats or members of the families have been ruthlessly murdered in the past few years by Armenian terrorists. These terrorists openly claim "credit" for their bloodletting, giving as their pretext the same one-sided distortion of events on which your statement is premised, events that occurred before the terrorists' victims were even born! Would you not agree that, leaving aside the Armenian distortions of history, fairness demands that you publicly and unequivocally condemn Armenian terrorism which is a part of international terrorism? I hope that you will do so in the very near future.

Statements by American lawmakers that embrace the very distortions that Armenian terrorists today murderously advertise are widely reported in the Turkish press. They create a public furor at a time when thousands of Turks, whose parents or grandparents perished at the hands of Armenian extremists during that tragic time of long ago, have laid aside the bitterness of the past to achieve reconciliation.

The United States and the Turkish Republic have maintained close relations for many years. These relations continue to strengthen to the great satisfaction of our two countries. Turkey provides an invaluable contribution to the protection of NATO's southern flank. Turkey shares a 1,000-mile border with the Soviet Union. The Turkish Straits are the only link between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. Turkey is in close proximity to the vital oil-producing areas of the Middle East.

There are some groups who would like nothing better than to damage severely relations between the U.S. and Turkey. Statements unjustly defaming Turkey provide these groups with the ammunition they seek.

Before you decide to make any statements in the future regarding Armenian allegations, I hope that you will consider that such statements, by glorifying their "cause," give Armenian terrorists more encouragement, however unintentional, for their violent acts. I also ask you to consider the negative effect of such an action on Turkish public opinion and the potentially adverse impact on U.S.-Turkish relations that may result as a consequence.

Above all, I ask that you seek unbiased sources of information regarding the Armenian allegations. You will find, I am sure, that distinguished scholars strongly dispute various Armenian descriptions of the events

of the period and, most especially, their characterization as genocide.

Sincerely,

SUKRU ELEKDAG,
Ambassador of the Turkish Republic.

The Ambassador's letter to Members of Congress began an extraordinary intensification of denying history and intimidating those who recognized the truth. In response to the Ambassador's ill-advised entreaty and in anticipation of his government's campaign, the following letter was conveyed by many of my colleagues on August 5, 1983.

His Excellency SUKRU ELEKDAG,
Ambassador of the Turkish Republic, Em-
bassy of Turkey, 1606 23d Street NW,
Washington, D.C. 20008

DEAR AMBASSADOR ELEKDAG: We have reviewed with considerable interest your letter of April 20 requesting that Members of Congress refrain from participating in the Special Order commemorating Armenian Martyrs' Day and a subsequent May 18 letter expressing your disappointment to those of us who did. We sincerely regret that you continue to misinterpret the clear intent of Congress in commemorating the Armenian Genocide and that you have failed to acknowledge the consistent record of the United States in recognition of this historical fact.

There is ample, reliable, and unbiased documentary evidence from the archives of Turkey's World War I friends and foes alike detailing the annihilation and displacement of the Armenian people. The same archival material conclusively identified the central role of the Young Turk Government in the planning and execution of what Ambassador Morgenthau referred to as "a campaign of race extermination." Reports of meetings between Mr. Morgenthau and the Young Turk leaders corroborate the reports from the United States consular officials.

The Armenian Genocide is an historical fact. To deny that fact is to deny also the unprecedented assistance extended by the United States in an attempt to end the carnage and to aid those who survived. Recalling these facts does not imply any disregard for Turkish lives lost today.

Our mutual abhorrence of terrorism and our common security interests cannot be invoked by our government to justify denial of Armenian and American history. The unambiguous record of the Armenian Genocide and the contemporary reaffirmations by President Reagan, former President Carter, the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, are realities based on an objective review of the subject.

We strongly recommend that your government consider reassessing its position on the Armenian Genocide.

Sincerely yours,

Congressman Charles Pashayan, Jr.;
Congresswoman Nancy Johnson;
Congresswoman Barbara Kennelly;
Congressman Robert Mrazek;
Congressman Sander Levin;
Congressman Marty Martinez;
Congresswoman Barbara Boxer;
Speaker Thomas O'Neill;
Congressman Peter Rodino;
Congresswoman Geraldine Ferraro;
Congressman Frank Guarini;
Congressman Peter Kostmayer;
Congressman Dan Lungren;
Congressman Bill Lowery;
Congressman Edward Roybal;
Congressman Mickey Leland;

Congressman Edward Markey;
Congressman Tony Coelho;
Congressman Frank Annunzio;
Congressman Mel Levine;
Congressman Bruce Vento;
Congressman Howard Berman;
Congressman Steward McKinney;
Congressman James Florio;
Congressman Henry Waxman;
Congressman Carlos Moorhead;
Congressman James Howard;
Congressman Michael Bilirakis;
Congressman Tom Lantos;
Congressman Joe Moakley;
Congressman Gary Ackerman;
Congressman Joseph Addabbo;
Congressman Michael Barnes;
Congressman Gene Chappie;
Congressman Vic Fazio;
Congresswoman Bobbi Fiedler;
Congressman Hamilton Fish;
Congressman Edwin Forsythe;
Congressman Barney Frank;
Congressman Sam Gejdenson;
Congressman Bill Green;
Congressman Edward Boland;
Congressman Nicholas Mavroules;
Congressman Martin Frost;
Congressman Esteban Torres;
Congressman Edward Feighan;
Congressman Bob Edgar;
Congressman Les Aspin.

Let me repeat and emphasize one sentence in particular: "Our mutual abhorrence of terrorism and our common security interests cannot be invoked by your government to justify denial of Armenian and American history." It is instructive to recognize for the record that some 8 months have elapsed without the courtesy of a reply—even without the common courtesy of a pro forma acknowledgement—from the Ambassador. It is sadly apparent that this precise and sincere expression of congressional concern must have served no constructive purpose for the Ambassador or the Republic of Turkey. Nevertheless, I urge the Republic of Turkey to cease its campaign of denial, a campaign that cannot succeed here in a free society. The healing process must begin as a matter of the highest priority. Once again I say to the Ambassador: "Let us talk."

Mr. Speaker, this Nation has a special responsibility to promote reconciliation through meaningful dialog. As the Nation that led the diplomatic efforts in an attempt to end the destruction of the Armenians, as the Nation that freely offered unprecedented humanitarian assistance to those who survived, and as the Nation that today is the Republic of Turkey's largest benefactor, the United States must assist this Turkish Government in breaking with its ignoble past. No constructive purpose can be served when U.S. departments and officials invoke the present special relationship between the United States and Turkey in pursuit of the effort to deny Armenian and American history. Shall we, despite ourselves, be setting a terrible precedent to shield a future client-state from a genocidal history? But

nothing could be more inimical to our cherished values, for freedom and truth cannot exist the one without the other.

But truth receives mortal wounds from innuendo. Indeed it is innuendo when the Turkish Government suggests that American recognition of the Armenian genocide is somehow damaging to the NATO alliance and to the relationship between the United States and Turkey within NATO. This unfortunate innuendo was contained in a recent letter to some of my colleagues from the Ambassador of Turkey, Sukru Elekdag, who I am sorry to say failed to send me a copy. The Armenian issue has nothing to do with the NATO alliance. Is West Germany any the less a valuable ally to NATO because her government stood for the truth and accounted for the genocides of the Nazi government? Surely not. Would Turkey be any the less valuable to the NATO alliance if she should follow the same civilized course as the Government of West Germany? Surely not.

I am therefore compelled to reproach the officials within the Department of State that, contrary to the statements of President Reagan in recognition of the Armenian genocide, have endeavored to dissuade both the House of Representatives and the other body from passing the resolutions, "To affirm the Armenian Genocide" and to commemorate Armenian Martyrs' Day as "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man."

I do so with considerable regret. It was my hope and assumption that the Department's agonizing retraction last year of a special note in the Department of State Bulletin that referred to the " * * * ambiguity * * *" of the record on the Armenian genocide would be a sufficient lesson to guard against future blunders.

I say to the Republic of Turkey and to those in our Government's service who have inadvertently advanced Turkey's cause: "These resolutions ultimately shall pass." History and truth are sacred; to violate them is to degrade civilization itself. There is a constant and an irreversible bipartisan recognition that history must not be violated and must be defended, and that the sacrifice of the Armenian people must be fully understood in order to preclude other peoples from a similar fate.

I am personally and painfully aware of the special duty felt by all Americans of Armenian descent on this most solemn day. I join with you in rededicating the Armenian ideals that allowed our people to survive as a Christian nation despite centuries of religious persecution. I join with you in rededicating the American ideal that provided the Armenian community

with the blessings of freedom and security essential for rebirth. I share with you in the words of the Governor of California, George Deukmejian:

We are often asked why we are so insistent on calling attention to atrocities that occurred many years ago. Why do we bring upon ourselves the pain of recalling the loss of families and friends and homes?

We have seen mankind at its best and its worst. By sharing this perspective with our fellow citizens and with succeeding generations, we can help summon in them the overpowering dream of peace and freedom that all people in this troubled world share. With God's help, I know we can make progress toward this dream. We owe it to our children, and we owe it to our parents and grandparents, who suffered so that we could reach this promised land called America.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MOORHEAD).

Mr. MOORHEAD. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. PASHAYAN) for taking this special order honoring the Armenian martyrs, who, 69 years ago today, became the victims of one of the great genocides of the world.

Today, April 24, is the 69th anniversary of that fateful day in 1915 that marked the beginning of what the Ottoman Empire thought would be a final solution of the Armenian question. The result of that policy decision by the Ottoman government was the premeditated murder of 1,500,000 Armenian men, women, and children. This figure represented nearly one-third of all Armenians then alive in the world. This policy decision of the Ottoman government expelled an entire people from their ancestral lands and scattered very few survivors over six continents.

Too often, when we think of genocide, we think of the millions of Jews and other people of central and eastern Europe who perished under Hitler's final solution. We also think of other horrible acts committed against people in Russia, Cambodia, Uganda, and other places around the world. But history has permitted this first genocide of the 20th century to go unnoticed. Those who were not killed were robbed of their ancestral homes and saw their cultural heritage threatened. Today Armenians flourish, and are prominent, and successful citizens of our country including the Governor of California, a U.S. Congressman, and a district attorney in Los Angeles County. Yet they are all still concerned that the martyrdom of their people must never be forgotten and that it should serve as a warning signal against other similar atrocities against another people.

No statement assigning responsibility for the genocide of the Armenian

people can detract or add to the horrible nature of the events themselves. To diminish in any way the events of 1915 and succeeding years is not only a great injustice in itself, but a great disservice to the memories of those who were killed and to their survivors and descendants. That is why I join with Armenians all over the world today in remembering Martyrs' Day today. No act of human destruction can be redeemed if it is not recognized, no act of human destruction can be memorialized if it is not mentioned, and no act of human destruction can be prevented in the future if it is not remembered. That is why to say "what's done is done" is wrong.

We recognize April 24 as the Day of Man's Inhumanity to Man because we must remember that in modern times acts of barbarism have continued unchecked. It is indeed a tragedy that in modern times many such acts have taken place. However, we must never become cynical or lose our hope that we will never again permit such atrocities. Today we will give encouragement to Armenians everywhere to continue their struggle for recognition and justice. Today we recall the results of evil so that we can renew our commitment and dedication to good. This, I believe, is the lesson of the 69th anniversary of the Armenian massacre.

Mr. PASHAYAN. I appreciate the gentleman from California for his well-stated remarks on a tragic event of history. He has always been a very special friend of the Armenian community. I know that the gentleman has worked very hard in their behalf. I want to say to the gentleman I appreciate it very much indeed.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI).

Mr. TORRICELLI. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, if I could ask that any message on any day might be heard when I rose in this Chamber, I would ask that the events being alluded to today, and that our words today be heard.

We have a special message on this day, April 24, a message that has hope that all the world will never forget. It is no coincidence that the message comes today from America, because it is part of the unique contribution of our country that people look here for a memory of the events of history; that people look to America for final justice.

Armenian genocide victims and their plight has been indelibly written in the black pages of human history. Sadly, their plight, their history, is not alone. Joining them in this century has been the death of countless Jews, Gypsies, Indians, and now Cambodians. Today we remember; we remember all victims. We remember be-

cause we seek justice in the pages of history; justice for those who are responsible. But we also live in the hope that a world that remembers has learned something.

So, today, as in all days, and, as on each April 24 we will rise in this Chamber so that the world will know that Americans, if no others, have not forgotten.

I thank the gentleman.

□ 1400

Mr. PASHAYAN. I thank my colleague for his generous comments, and I appreciate his support of a day that is appreciated by so many people in the United States.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASHAYAN. I would be happy to yield to the minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for taking this special order.

Mr. Speaker, in the past I have joined with our colleagues in commemorating the suffering and deaths of Armenians in Turkey over 65 years ago. I am glad to have this opportunity to once again look at the fate of the Armenians and to see what lesson we can learn from the past.

I think the word "lesson" is all-important here. Mere dwelling on ancient wrongs does not prepare us to avoid such evils in the present or the future. And denials that such evils ever took place only make matters worse.

Our job is to learn from the evils of the past, so we will not have to relive them, as the philosopher once said. In the case of the Armenians, the lesson is clear: The protection of minority rights isn't just a procedure under which a government should operate. It is an absolute and primary responsibility of civilized people.

There is one other point I wish to make. It concerns the allegation that speaking of the Armenian massacres somehow or other inflames terrorists who, today, kill Turks in the name of the martyred Armenian dead.

But to say that we must never talk about past injustices because in doing so we might incite terrorism today is to miss the essential point of special orders such as this one.

It is precisely because we know how horrible terrorism is that we keep reminding ourselves and the world about atrocities that happened years ago.

To suggest that we remain silent because somehow—it is never clearly shown how—our words about yesterday's terror causes terrorism today is rather absurd. Terrorism, whether committed in the name of a state or a cause, is still terrorism and deserves to be condemned.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to thank the gentleman from California for taking this special order to point out this Armenian Day of Remembrance, and I appreciate his yielding to me for my participation.

Mr. PASHAYAN. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for his remarks. I know personally that he has worked very hard, very industriously, on the part of Armenian Americans all over the land. His district is in Illinois, but he has a national constituency when it comes to the Armenian Americans, and I want to thank him very much indeed for all the work he has done and continues to do on this unhappy issue.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASHAYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for scheduling this special order. I think the great significance of calling to mind the atrocities that were perpetrated against the Armenian people is so that people will not forget.

It is a fascinating commentary on human nature, but as great events in history occur, particularly tragic events, time goes on and people forget and new generations come along and they cannot comprehend that man could be so inhumane to other men. But it is apparently a part of human nature that these things happen.

I think if we are to be governed in the future by judgments based on our experiences in the world, it is indispensable that we recall some of these very tragic events, because history has a way of repeating itself, human nature being a constant.

The holocaust, the genocide, the atrocities that were perpetrated against the Armenian people must never be forgotten. Similarly, the holocaust against the Jewish people in the last war must never be forgotten. But these are a part of the fabric of history and they are events that ought to condition our morality and our judgment in the future.

So we must never forget, unpleasant as it is, the dimensions, the happening to the helpless and hapless Armenians that the gentleman is so thoughtfully bringing to our attention and I salute him for doing it.

Mr. PASHAYAN. I appreciate the words of the gentleman, and I take it, by his remarks, that the gentleman agrees that it also is important to recognize the U.S. policy toward these events, the recognition of the historical fact that it occurred and the subsequent events with which the United States historically has had such intimate contact.

Mr. HYDE. Exactly. The gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. PASHAYAN. I appreciate all the work the gentleman has done. He sits on one of the very important committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that has before it one resolution, and the gentleman is an astute student of the NATO alliance and some of the other regions of the world, and I appreciate his standing up for this very unhappy issue.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASHAYAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TORRES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague and friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. PASHAYAN), for requesting this special order. It is very important that we do so today. It is very important for our Nation, for my constituency, for my colleagues.

I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating the Armenian genocide. This brutal inhumane atrocity, which took place between 1915 and 1918, resulted in the death of 1.5 million Armenian children, women, and men at the hands of the Ottoman Empire.

The near total annihilation of the world's Armenian people is a tragedy we must continue to recognize for years to come. Mr. Speaker, we must not allow the world to forget what happened 69 years ago. It is important that each year we in Congress come together to remember this tragic event and bring it to the attention of our constituents and our Nation. Only by recalling this ruthless disregard for human life can we prevent such heinous actions from reoccurring. Our Nation must continue to recognize Armenian Martyrs' Day, so that we can prevent this type of atrocity from ever happening again to any people in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues of the House to join me in mourning this inhumane tragedy on this occasion.

Mr. PASHAYAN. I thank my colleague for his kind words and say that it is appreciated very much by the Armenian-American community.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASHAYAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Congressman PASHAYAN, for arranging this special order to recognize Armenian Martyrs' Day. Sixty-nine years ago today, the genocide of the Armenian people began. This also marks the 14th congressional recognition of this tragic event.

Between April 24, 1915, and the end of 1918, 1.5 million Armenians were killed, and most Armenian citizens of the Ottoman Empire were either driven into exile or hiding. This reign

of terror resulted in an entire people being forced to flee their ancestral homelands of 3,000 years.

Records of the State Department attest to the terrible loss of life during this, the first genocide of the 20th century. The Armenian genocide should live on as a reminder of what must be avoided at all cost: man's inhumanity to man. As former President Carter stated in 1978:

I feel very deeply that I, as President, ought to make sure that this (Armenian genocide) is never forgotten.

Toward this end, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, established by an act of Congress in 1980, has unanimously resolved to include the Armenian genocide in its museum and educational programs.

We must also strive to put a positive light on this day. I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the enormous contributions of the Armenian Americans, who have merged their own unique culture and heritage with ours, and who have played such an active and positive public role to improve the quality of life for all of us.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASHAYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RUDD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join our colleagues in thanking the gentleman for taking out this special order to eulogize what happened to the Armenians in World War I, the atrocities that occurred because of the tyrannical government of the Ottoman Turks, and to also point out that these good Armenians who had to flee that tyranny and came to our country have made up a great segment of fine, loyal Americans who will remain adamant against tyranny anywhere in the world because of the memory, if nothing else that occurs, because of the memory of those atrocities.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to point out that the Communist Empire, the Soviet Empire, rules by the same methods, methods of tyranny, murder, bloodshed, and genocide. They use it as a policy for government at home and they use it as a foreign policy measuring stick to accomplish hegemony or attempt to establish hegemony over the nations of the world. Let us not forget that this genocide operation continues today, but I do commend my friend and my colleague, the gentleman from California, for taking this special order.

Mr. PASHAYAN. I appreciate the good words from my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Arizona. It is appreciated by many millions of people in the United States as well.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASHAYAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LENT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today to commemorate April 24 as Armenian Martyrs' Day. This annual day of sorrowful remembrance by Members of this distinguished body has a twofold purpose. The first is to pay tribute to the memory of nearly 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children who were victims of the Ottoman Turkish Empire's systematic extermination efforts. Second, our recognition of the Armenian genocide as historical fact will serve as a painful reminder that the genocide of these innocent people and other victims of man's bigotry and hatred of his fellowman must never be forgotten.

There is a multitude of unbiased documentary evidence of that period during World War I when the Armenian people were methodically uprooted from their homeland of 3,000 years and were eliminated through massacre of exile. Beginning in 1914, all able-bodied Armenian men, with few exceptions, were called into military service. Later, these Armenian soldiers were segregated into separate battalions and disarmed. Then, they were either worked to death or massacred.

Under government order, whole villages were massacred outright in the fall and winter of 1914 in eastern provinces. Women and children were banished from their homes and marched across Asia Minor and Turkish Armenia to the Syrian desert. Some were murdered, others left to starve, or become the unprotected victims of bandits and killers along the way.

Only the very strong and resourceful were able to escape to other nearby regions: some to Russia, others to Arab countries, Europe, and the United States. Thus, the Armenians of the Ottoman Turkish Empire were virtually eliminated from their ancestral homeland a result of a carefully executed government plan of genocide. Many of those who returned after the war were again subject to the Turkish Government's bloody purge of their people.

It is a credit to the U.S. Government, and the then-Ambassador Morgenthau, for its role to implement immediate action for the protection and humane treatment of the Armenians in an attempt to end this carnage and bloodshed. American assistance was able to reach many survivors to provide food and basic necessities, saving many lives.

To this day, the Turkish Government categorically denies its responsibility for this horrible crime on a gigantic scale which compares only to Hitler's program of the Jewish people. The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council unanimously included the Armenian genocide by the Ottoman Turkish

Empire in a place of prominence in the Holocaust Memorial Museum.

History cannot be denied. As Members of this hallowed body and as leaders of the free world, we have a special obligation to recall the facts of history, to remember this terrible atrocity, so that there will be no doubt to diminish the suffering and anguish endured by the Armenian people during those painful years.

As we commemorate April 24 as Armenian Martyrs' Day, let each of us reflect on its meaning and importance. Let us pledge our united efforts to combat such persecution wherever it occurs. Let us reaffirm our support to these courageous people who preserved against tremendous odds and sacrifice to maintain their very lives, their dignity, and unique American heritage. Let our commitment to human rights and the value of human life be a symbol of our need to remember the tragic lesson of the Armenian Martyrs.

Mr. PASHAYAN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I thank all the gentlemen for their work on behalf of Americans of Armenian descent in recognizing a heinous crime of history.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASHAYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in commending our colleague, the gentleman from California, for bringing this special order to the floor today, for giving the House and, in fact, for giving this Nation an opportunity to reflect on one of the most heinous acts that has occurred in this century, and that is the genocide of tens of thousands of Armenians in the early part of this century.

Mr. Speaker, April 24, 1984, marks the 69th anniversary of the dark night in 1915 when intellectual, religious, and political leaders of the Armenian community were rounded up and murdered by the Turkish Government. After this terrifying first strike, a sinister plan for the annihilation of the Armenian people quickly unfolded. For the next 8 years, Armenians were executed and exiled. By 1923, 1.5 million were dead; 500,000 more were forced on long marches to distant lands. The entire Armenian nation was banished from its ancestral homelands.

But only 20 years after the fact, the century's first genocide was the "forgotten genocide." As Hitler paused on the edge of his own reign of terror, he asked, "Who remembers the Armenians?" And no one had. A world blind to the lessons of history saw them repeated on an even larger scale.

Never before has a loud and clear condemnation of this historical atrocity

been more needed. The Turkish Government loudly denies that a genocide ever took place, hoping the world will forget. And with their lies, they are attempting a new genocide—the deliberate and systematic destruction of Armenian history.

This distortion of history is as awful a crime as the original murders. The historical record of the 1915 events is not ambiguous. It is as clear and lurid a picture of man's inhumanity to man as you will ever see.

And if the State Department does not want to believe me, they can take a look at their own historical archives, where they will find telegrams from the U.S. Ambassador to Turkey, Henry Morgenthau:

"The whole history of the world contains no such episode as this," he said. "When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well . . . and they made no particular attempt to conceal the fact."

Nor was Morgenthau alone in his judgment. All of the American people share a proud record of humanitarian concern for the victims of the genocide. And their compassion was backed by action: Congress chartered the Near East Relief Organization, which contributed \$115 million to the survivors of the tragedy; 132,000 Armenian orphans became foster children to American parents; and the Senate passed a resolution condemning the Turkish atrocities.

Since then, American statesmen have consistently condemned the genocide. The "allegations" that the State Department is so unwilling to endorse come from no lesser authority than the last two Presidents of the United States—Mr. Carter and Mr. Reagan—who both have publicly mourned the events of 1915.

This special order carries on that enlightened and compassionate tradition. It tells the Armenian survivors, the American people, and the world that we remember the tragedy—and that we will never let short-term political considerations stand in the way of our basic belief that all people have the right to live in freedom and die with dignity.

I urge adoption of the resolution.

□ 1410

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) for his kind words, and I am sure that they are appreciated by many people.

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASHAYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend's yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, Harry Truman was very fond of saying that "the only things we don't know is the history

that we have forgotten." The purpose of this commemoration today is to help the world not forget.

This is the 69th anniversary of one of the greatest testimonies of man's inhumanity to man—a million Armenian men, women, and children subjected, repressed, and brutally murdered by an empire that clearly was struggling to hold on to that which it was ultimately going to be incapable of saving. Failing to remember what occurred 69 years ago commits us to relive those deeds in history again. To allow this tragedy, which presages the Holocaust of Europe and the subjugation of the people of Afghanistan or any one of countless other vile deeds done by a government, a government that does not in any way claim to speak for the legitimate rights of our people, to go unnoticed condemns us and our children to relive those deeds.

We need these kinds of memorial moments, and I thank my friend, the gentleman from California, for letting us tell the world that we do care, that we have not forgotten, and that we are committed and dedicated to not allowing it to happen again.

Mr. Speaker, today we pause to pay tribute and honor to the memory of the 1,500,000 Armenian men, women, and children who were brutally massacred by the Ottoman Turkish Empire.

From 1915 to 1923 three-fourths of the Armenian nation became victims of this tragic massacre, their only crime being their nationality and faith. It is important to remember that this unfortunate genocide promulgated the Holocaust of World War II. This tragic event serves to remind mankind that these genocides are historical realities which can never and should never be blocked from the conscience of all mankind.

On this day we mark the 14th congressional recognition of Armenian Martyr's Day and the 69th anniversary of man's inhumanity to man. This is a difficult day for Armenians throughout the world, who are commemorating the senseless destruction of their people.

The United States played a significant role in attempting to prevent this violent tragedy and in assisting those who survived. The U.S. Memorial Council has unanimously resolved to include the Armenian genocide in its museum and educational programs.

I urge my colleagues to pause for a moment of silence to remember and understand what happened to the Americans so that similar crimes against humanity can be prevented.

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's kind words, and I appreciate his coming here to participate in this special order. I know that many of our colleagues are not in Washington today, this being a very light workweek, but those who are here I appreciate.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASHAYAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. PASHAYAN) for yielding to me, and I want to salute the gentleman for bringing this special order to us. I also would like to be associated with his remarks.

In particular, I would like to be associated also with the remarks of the Republican leader of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL). I think it is altogether appropriate that we have this special order, not only in remembrance of the better than 1 million American men, women, and children who lost their lives but for their descendants who cherish their heritage. Again I salute the gentleman from California for appropriately, on April 24, bringing this special order to us.

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. MARTIN) for his kind words.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASHAYAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in performing a sacred and important task. I rise today to acknowledge and remember the tragic genocide that was conceived and implemented by the Turkish Government from 1915 to 1923, resulting in the extermination of 1½ million Armenian men, women, and children, the deportation of an additional 500,000 survivors, and the elimination of a 2,500-year Armenian presence in its historic homeland.

To this very day, the Turkish Government has continued to deny its actions of destruction against the Armenians. Moreover, Turkey has expressed its discontent with the United States, which has condemned the Turkish Government for its actions. Despite the persistent denials of the Turkish Government, the fact of the Armenian genocide was confirmed in Senate Resolution 359, dated May 13, 1920, which stated in part, "the testimony adduced at the hearings conducted by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations have clearly established the truth of the reported massacres and other atrocities from which the Armenian people suffered." There is also substantial evidence in the National Archives documenting this tragic event.

As distressing as the genocide itself, are the repeated attempts to deny its occurrence. No matter how tragic an event, be it the Armenian genocide or the Jewish Holocaust, it is imperative that the events leading up to, during, and following this disaster perpetrated by man be kept fresh in our minds.

Purging our minds of the evil actions that members of the human race have committed can only result in the repetition of them. When Hitler was about to begin the Holocaust and a member of his staff asked him what the world would think, Hitler is reported to have replied, "who remembers the Armenians?" It is in this light that I, as a member of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, am pleased that the Council has unanimously resolved to include the Armenian genocide in the Holocaust Museum Memorial. We do remember the Armenians, and are determined that such genocide shall not again occur.

To quote the Armenian Genocide Commemorative Fund, remembering the Armenian genocide would be—

... an affirmation that those who perished did not die in vain, but will be remembered to prevent other human beings from suffering the same fate ... an affirmation that those who survived an inhuman ordeal shall be honored for their courage ... an affirmation that, in this nation founded on the ideals of personal and religious freedom, the results of the abrogation of those precious liberties must be studied and made a part of human understanding.

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want not only to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GREEN) for his remarks but also to thank him for the many hours of work on the Holocaust Council that I know he has put in on behalf of the Armenian genocide's recognition. I understand that certain governments—not the U.S. Government, of course, because it is the policy of the U.S. Government to recognize the genocide as an historical fact—but certain governments have pressured and exerted pressure on the Holocaust Council; namely, the Government of Turkey, to remove the Armenian genocide as one of the features of the Holocaust Memorial. I know that the gentleman from New York has resisted that attempt and has stood up in favor of the Armenian genocide's being included.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PASHAYAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding again, and I want to thank him for his kind words. The gentleman does accurately state the situation, that certain representations have been made to us, but the history of the event is very clear, and it has, as I documented in my statement which will be printed in the RECORD, been determined contemporaneously by the Congress of the United States that in fact that genocide did occur which in fact we are discussing today. I think the record is very clear.

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make it very clear again that I appreciate the courage of the gentleman in standing up to a particular for-

eign government that has attempted to have the Armenian genocide removed. I know it takes courage to stand up to pressure like that, and I appreciate it.

□ 1420

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASHAYAN. I am happy to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to congratulate him for bringing this matter to the attention of our colleagues via this special order.

Those of us who are Californians, but not of Armenian descent, have certainly been impacted by the experience of the Armenian community in that in most cases we have come into contact with the Armenian community of California and we have learned from those members of that community the very close experience they have had, that virtually every person you talk to of Armenian extraction has had a relative not more than a generation from the present who was affected by the genocide in a very real way.

Sometimes it makes it difficult for us to comprehend the magnitude of the genocide that took place, yet it is absolutely impossible to deny, just based on the eye witness accounts and the experiences that are still so very real in the members of the Armenian community.

I think those of us in California are particularly affected, since we have seen members of the Armenian community succeed in such high positions of authority; the Governor of the State of California, the district attorney of Los Angeles County, many judges, many people throughout our community and the professional and business world who are direct descendants of those who suffered just a bit over a half century ago.

Just to try to change history for whatever purpose now is inappropriate. We can only learn from history if we have a true recitation of what the historical facts are. It serves no purpose whatsoever for us to gloss over it any more than it does for us to dwell on something unnecessarily.

This is an episode that occurred. It is a fact which we must recognize. Hopefully, it is one we can learn from, but I think we deny it only at our peril or we deny it in a sense as a slap in the face to those of Armenian extraction who serve in the United States at the present time in any number of capacities.

I think the gentleman is to be commended for again bringing it to our attention here on the House floor and making it absolutely clear what the historical record is and what the official position of the U.S. Government has been for many years.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my colleague from California, my classmate of 1979. I know the gentleman to be a good friend of the Armenian community. I appreciate his kind words and his taking a moment to spend some time on the floor today.

□ 1430

● Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in commemorating this anniversary of one of the most brutal events in this century. On April 24, 1915, the Ottoman Empire began its ruthless campaign to exterminate the Armenian population. By 1923, 1.5 million Armenian people had lost their lives and another 500,000 had been exiled from their ancestral homeland.

This act of wholesale annihilation set the stage for Hitler's attempted extermination of the Jewish people. He justifies his plan to doubting coconspirators with the reasoning that no one remembered the Armenian genocide that had taken place only 15 years earlier.

We cannot let this dark episode in the history of the world be forgotten ever again. We must remember this tragedy in order to learn from it. It should serve as a reminder of the capacity for evil that exists.

The strong and spirited race of Armenians was not wiped out, despite the efforts of the Ottoman Empire, and we rejoice in their survival. On this day of remembrance, we should put all of our energy toward a celebration of life and toward a lifelong commitment to the prevention of such horrendous acts. This is a day to remember that we, as people, can learn from tragedy and must work together to eliminate racial and religious hatred from our lives and from the world.●

● Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in support of today's special order in reflection of the tragedy and contemporary relevance of the Armenian genocide. I join with my colleagues in remembering the sacrifice of 1.5 million men, women, and children. I would like to take this opportunity to submit, for my colleagues consideration, a short article written by a constituent of mine, entitled "Armenians Remember." Gary Khachian, from Fairfield, Conn., remembers for himself and his family the tragedy of the Armenian genocide. I believe Gary sets the record straight.

I commend the following essay:

ARMENIANS REMEMBER

(By Gary Khachian)

Holocaust. To most the word evokes images of Hitler, swastikas, and concentration camps. To the small Armenian community at Brown, it also signifies the wholesale massacre of 1.5 million Armenians at the hands of their Turkish oppressors during the early part of this century. The Turks systematic methods of extermination provided models for the Nazis some thirty years later.

I am a third-generation Armenian-American from Fairfield, Connecticut. What does the faraway land of Armenia, now a part of the Soviet Union, mean to me? Outwardly, it allows me to enjoy the rich cultural benefits of Armenian food, music, art, and religion.

On a deeper level, however, it compels me to remember sad stories. It reminds me that my great-grandfather—after whom I was named—was taken to prison by Turkish soldiers. He was later killed for the sole reason of being a college professor. It reminds me that my grandmother survived only by hiding fearfully in stables from the gendarmes in charge of deportation and by walking through the deserts of Syria without food or water, until she reached safety in Cyprus. My family is no exception. The story remains the same no matter which of your Armenian friends recounts it. The Genocide lies at the heart of Armenians' lives. It provides the common bond which holds us together across six different continents.

Armenian terrorists groups have captured headlines for their bombings and killings of Turkish diplomats. Unfortunately, Armenian terrorists, numbering less than 1,000 of a total Armenian population of 6.5 million, have obfuscated the real issues of past injustices and reparation by using unacceptable means. Most Armenians do not condone terrorism. Nor, however, can they condone the appalling events of 1915, the results of which have caused this new wave of violence. After the smoke of terrorist events is cleared, the facts of the Armenian Genocide remain.

By 1923, the Turkish government had exterminated approximately three-quarters of the Armenian population living in Turkey and Armenia. Ever since the Ottoman Turks occupied historical Armenian territory, there had been religious differences between the peoples. During World War I, the Moslem Turks found a way to settle the Christian "Armenian question" once and for all, by claiming that Armenians sided disloyally with the Russians. The first victims were soldiers, able-bodied men, and intellectuals. The remaining women, children and elders were forcefully marched to the Syrian deserts. Those who did not die along the way from starvation or dehydration were often killed once they reached their destination. Of the small number of survivors, many left their homeland forever, settling in all parts of the world. One of the oldest known civilizations, Armenia lost its independence in 1920 and is now under Soviet domination.

It is not only the United States Ambassador to Turkey at the time, Henry Morgenthau, Sr., who recognized these atrocities. The entire world has. Yet, the Turkish governments continue to deny the guilt of their forefathers. First-generation Armenians of the diaspora, weak and disorganized, were able to do little to combat the official Turkish version of what happened. Armenians today seek to restore a more accurate historical perspective. Many people know nothing of the events surrounding the Genocide. Many know not even of its existence.

Although we stand three generations removed from the massacre, we still feel its presence and would like to share our experience. In order that human civilization recognize and avert similar occurrences in the future, the truth of the Armenian Genocide must be known.●

● Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, April 24, 1984, marks the 69th anniversary of Armenian Martyrs' Day, the 69th anniversary of the beginning of a campaign of genocide against the Armenian people.

In the mass destruction which ensued between 1915 and 1923 over 1.5 million Armenians were massacred in their own homeland. Whole villages were wiped out, thousands of individuals were deported, and countless others fled into the desert, where many perished from exposure or disease. Their property was sequestered, and many centuries of culture destroyed.

We commemorate the Armenian genocide in part to pay tribute to its survivors and to the memory of its victims, and in part to reinforce our own determination to insure such deeds will not be repeated. We in this body must continue to speak out on atrocities that happened in the past and keep a vigil for those that may happen in the future. Without a firm eye on history, man can only repeat his mistakes.

● Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, today we are commemorating the 68th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Let us not deceive ourselves, let us not use semantics to confuse the issue—there was a premeditated attempt at exterminating the Armenian people—if that, by definition, is not genocide, than what is?

But Mr. Speaker, I do not want to stand here today and use the time of this assembly to discuss the accuracy of the historical record. That there was a genocide has been documented by more historians, more archives, and engraved indelibly upon the hearts and souls of more survivors than there is time to document before this House today. What I would like to go on record for is noting that what occurred in this body 2 weeks ago regarding the passage of a simple commemorative resolution is a startling disregard for the historical record. House Joint Resolution 247 was to commemorate a Day of Man's Inhumanity to Man, especially noting the massacres of the Armenian people during 1915-20, by the Ottoman Turks. Although there were objections on a variety of grounds, the most disturbing was the claim that the resolution was undocumented and inaccurate.

Now the passage of a commemorative resolution is a small thing, but ignoring the truth is not.

Richard Cohen, a columnist for the Washington Post wrote, "to control the present and shape the future, you have to first alter the past—take possession of it and rob it of its lessons." It is a point worth pondering, and one totalitarian governments understand well. After the confusion over the passage of House Joint Resolution 247, I

am beginning to fear not that we are ignorant of this, but rather that perhaps we are beginning to understand it too well.

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased again this year to join with my colleagues who are participating today in the special order in remembrance of the Armenian genocide.

Many of us in Congress are well aware of the horrible brutalities committed against the Armenian people in Turkey from 1915 to 1923. Over 1½ million Armenian men, women, and children were methodically persecuted and massacred by the Ottoman Empire, virtually destroying the Armenian community which had thrived for over 3,000 years. Despite the enormous magnitude of these crimes, the facts about the genocide are not well known to the American public.

The Armenian genocide of 1915-23 is a well documented, if not well-known, fact. During those years, many newspaper and periodical articles recounted the abhorrent truth about what was taking place. In 1918, former U.S. Ambassador to Turkey, Henry Morgenthau, Sr., wrote of the massacre:

I have by no means told the most terrible details, for a complete narration of the sadistic orgies of which these Armenian men and women were the victims can never be printed in an American publication. Whatever crimes the most debased imagination can conceive, became the daily misfortunes of this devoted people. I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared with the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915.

The shocking events of those years must be remembered, not solely because 1½ million Armenians were ruthlessly murdered, but to insure that we guard against atrocities as these from ever happening again.

Along with almost 70 of my colleagues, I have cosponsored House Resolution 171, a resolution affirming and embracing the historical events of the Armenian genocide. This resolution takes on even greater significance in light of the U.S. State Department's apparent unwillingness to acknowledge the widely accepted facts concerning this horrible chapter in the annals of humanity. I believe very strongly that the time has come for the State Department to recognize long-acknowledged historical facts, make the necessary retractions, and publish an account that is more consistent with documented facts.

As you remember, just 13 days ago on April 11, House Joint Resolution 247 was offered under the unanimous-consent rule. This resolution would have marked today, April 24, 1984, as "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man," a day to commemorate all the victims of genocide, but in particular, those slain

during the Armenian genocide. One lone objector that day forced the resolution to be tabled.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor House Resolution 171 to demonstrate to the American people and to the people of the world, that the U.S. Congress acknowledges and embraces the historical record chronicling the slaughter and attempted extermination of the Armenian people.

Now is a time for all of us to remember not only that 1½ million Armenians were massacred, but that we must always be prepared to counter the forces that would permit such atrocities ever to occur again.

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we join today to remember a dark period in world history when 1.5 million Armenian people were murdered between 1915 and 1923 by the Ottoman government.

In recognizing Armenian Martyrs' Day, we recall this attempted genocide of a race of people and reaffirm our determination to prevent future attempts to eliminate an entire sect of our world's population. As a result of the Armenian genocide, the population of Armenians living in the nation known today as Turkey has been reduced from 2.5 million yearly in this century to just 100,000. Many Armenians who survived the genocide made their way to the United States, and these survivors and their families have made important contributions over the years to our Nation and our culture.

As the leader of the free world, our Nation must strive to promote peace and the respect for human rights. That is why I have cosponsored two House resolutions, House Resolution 171 and House Joint Resolution 247, which reaffirm our Nation's documentation of the genocide of the Armenian people and establishes a National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man. Recalling the tragic events of the past is essential to insure that our Nation does not permit similar acts from occurring in the future.

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 69th anniversary of the start of the first planned genocide of the 20th century. On April 24, 1915, the intellectual and spiritual leaders of the Armenian community in Turkey were arrested and sent into an exile that many would not survive. Once the leaders were removed, a systematic program for uprooting and deporting nearly all of the Armenians in Turkey was begun. That program would result in the deaths of more than 1 million people and the virtual obliteration of the Armenian population in Turkey. Today we acknowledge the pain and suffering of these men, women, and children who died for no other reason than the fact they were Armenians.

The Armenian tragedy would have been an unspeakable horror even if it had been the only such act to blacken the history of the world in this century. As we are painfully aware, however, it was merely a foretaste of similar acts which would occur in Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union, Uganda, and Cambodia. The silence with which the community of nations greeted the decimation of the Armenian people may have emboldened those who would later perpetrate similar acts. It certainly had an effect on Adolf Hitler who, while planning the extermination of millions of Jews was asked how the world would respond to a program of mass murder. In reply Hitler said, "Who remembers the Armenians?"

Armenian Martyrs' Day gives the Congress of the United States a chance to show that our country remembers the Armenians. We remember the manner in which they became scattered over the face of the Earth, and we remember that no Turkish Government since 1915 has acknowledged the role of its predecessor, the Ottoman Turkish Government in the terrible events of 69 years ago. The world's best defense against future acts of genocide lies in actively denouncing those which have already occurred, and in fully understanding the events which surrounded them. Refusing to acknowledge the occurrence of activities such as the ones which took place in Armenia, especially when they are well chronicled, compounds the original tragedy and serves no useful purpose. The first step toward the resolution of the issues which divide Armenians and Turks will only be taken when the Government of Turkey acknowledges this unhappy chapter in the history of its country.

Mr. Speaker, if the purpose of the activities begun in 1915 was to destroy the Armenian race, failure has been the result. The Armenians have survived their holocaust and have, by their unwavering courage and determination, preserved their race. Today they contribute to the societies of many lands, including our own. My home city of Springfield, Mass., has benefited from the industry and loyalty of a large and active Armenian population. As members of that community gather in their churches to reflect on the events which drove them from their homeland, let us acknowledge our admiration for their strength in the face of adversity and our gratitude for their many contributions to the United States. Above all, let each of us, Armenian and non-Armenian alike, rededicate ourselves to the struggle against racial and religious oppression and the silence of indifference in which they thrive.●

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, today is the 69th anniversary of Armenian Martyrs' Day. I would like to com-

memorate, with my colleagues, the tragic loss of lives.

The genocide of the Armenian people began in 1894 and continued through until 1923. Under the Ottoman Empire, the Armenians were viewed as a threat to the Turkish Government because of religious and cultural differences. And so, these people were systematically and deliberately exterminated; a fact many wish to disclaim.

We cannot let this historical atrocity be denied or forgotten. If we allow the memory to fade, we are inviting a recurrence of the deed. By establishing April 24 as Armenian Martyrs' Day, the United States is not only expressing its abhorrence of such a vile act, but we are commemorating the lives of hundreds of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders who were arrested, murdered, or exiled on April 24, 1915.

I join with Americans of Armenian descent today, in expressing my regard for the courage of a people who were so violently attacked. By recognizing the Armenian martyrs, we can illustrate our activism in preserving human rights, in the hope of avoiding future massacres such as this. Our aim is to preserve the memory of the Armenian genocide, and hence, disallow a recurrence—we owe this to the Armenian men and women who were denied their right to life.●

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues to participate in the observance of Armenian Martyrs' Day. I also want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. PASHAYAN) for his initiative in raising the public awareness of a most bleak and horrendous chapter in 20th-century history.

As we are all painfully aware, it was on this day in 1915 that the systematic massacre against the Armenian people began. Although discrimination and persecution against the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire existed for decades, April 24, 1915, marks the date that events took on a more gruesome and expanded dimension. Without depicting the horrors of that period, it is paramount that all of us here today, as well as the rest of mankind, take a moment to ponder what happened to the Armenians. Perhaps if the Armenian episode had not receded from public consciousness, the atrocities of Nazi Germany could have been prevented or mitigated.

It is truly a sad commentary on the state of human affairs that such periods in our history exist. We owe it to every victim of genocide to remember the abominations of the past, to better understand and appreciate the magnitude of suffering involved, to educate our children about genocide, and to act with vigor and vigilance in deterring other governments from engaging in such nefarious policies.

Indifference to genocide will condemn us as accomplices to these odious acts. Fortunately, this Chamber has established a mechanism—the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, which I chair—to serve as a catalyst in addressing human rights abuses such as genocide. The subcommittee will continue to pursue this mission with a deep sense of responsibility.

I fervently hope that on every April 24 we will continue to reflect for a moment on the suffering experienced by millions of Armenians earlier in this century. May we continue to pay tribute and recognition to Armenian Martyrs' Day, and may this day have special significance to all who share the common desire of eradicating genocide from the face of the Earth forever.●

● Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, April 24, we look back and reflect on an event that is so shocking that it is hard to comprehend. The policy of deliberate genocide inflicted on the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire between 1915 and 1917 shocked those who knew about it at the time. With the end of the Great War, when the facts of the genocide became fully known, the rest of the world shared the horrible prospect of the attempted elimination of an entire people. Over 1,500,000 people died in Armenia during the war, victims of racial hatred.

Given all that has come after this terrible opening chapter of man's inhumanity to man in the 20th century, it is hard to believe that today we find people who are eager to dispute the event or who are willing to brush the whole thing under the rug because it will muck things up.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, genocide does tend to muck things up. Genocide does tend to make it difficult to carry on normal relations with those responsible for it. But surely that is no reason to ignore the basic fact that 1,500,000 suffered a brutal death. Nor is it any reason to deny them a modicum of respect. Let us take this time to reflect on what this incident tells us about ourselves, about our blind passions, about our fears and about our willingness to look the other way when people are being killed for no better reason than that they speak a different language, profess a different religion or have skin a different color. Too often, we, as human beings, have found it convenient to ignore the darker side of our nature. We can do so no longer, for we all suffer a great loss when we do so. Let us contemplate the frightful experience of the Armenian people. Let us look to the future and pledge that never again will such an episode occur.●

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, today, April 24, marks what we choose to call the 69th anniversary of one of the most brutal and least recognized crimes in human history, the Armenian genocide. But the magnitude of this atrocity cannot be contained by one day alone. For over 6 years, beginning in 1915, the Ottoman Turkish Government carried out policies that lead to the deaths of more than 1.5 million Armenians and the dislocation of countless others. Yet today, 69 years after eyewitness accounts described the terrible events, the current Turkish Government refuses to even acknowledge what that previous government did.

It is of paramount importance that we do not let this tragedy be forgotten with the passage of time. This act of inhumanity, based on religious and nationalistic grounds, was as terrible as any manmade catastrophe to that time yet only two decades later Hitler could ask "Who remembers the Armenians?" Perhaps if the world had paid more attention to the plight of the Armenian massacre later tragedies could have been averted. But there is still time to learn the lesson of Armenia and apply it to the future. Holocausts must not be forgotten.

But more important than what we say here today is the pressure that we must continue to apply to the current Turkish Government, a government which, by its denial of the events of 1915-23, brings further shame to the people of that nation. A crime of this kind cannot be allowed to be covered up. Only by open and unanimous recognition of such an atrocity can its like be prevented from ever occurring again.

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be a cosponsor of House Resolution 171, introduced by Mr. PASHAYAN, and am glad to join him in this special order to remember and reflect upon the Armenian genocide. But I must say that I am unhappy that it has become necessary for Congress to resort to this legislation. After all, the need for this legislation only arose 2 years ago when the State Department issued an ambiguous note. It seemed to imply that the United States no longer recognized that the Armenian genocide had taken place. The purpose of this legislation was to clarify and reaffirm America's recognition and condemnation of that massacre. It is very unfortunate that the State Department did not on its own initiative act to clear up the matter.

Mr. Speaker, every President since Woodrow Wilson has recognized this massacre, and the American people have been unified in condemning it. It is very important that we keep this atrocity fresh in our memories, so that we may prevent any recurrence. The State Department does humanity a disservice by seeking to sow doubt as

to whether this massacre occurred. The State Department adds insult to injury when it implies that Members of this body, as well as the many Americans who seek to commemorate the genocide, are somehow giving comfort to terrorists. We all condemn the cowardly acts of violence that have taken place, but this is not a reason to wipe our memories clean of the atrocities which were perpetrated against the Armenian people. I am appalled that the State Department has chosen to engage in this sort of harmful rhetoric. I urge my colleagues to pass House Resolution 171, and I would like to thank Congressmen PASHAYAN, WAXMAN, and COELHO for the leadership role they have taken on this issue.

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, an honor for me to rise today to join in the solemn observance of Armenian Martyr Day. This year marks the 69th anniversary of the genocide of the Armenian people by the Turkish rulers of the Ottoman Empire. It has been estimated that some 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children were killed and another 500,000 exiled from their traditional homeland by their Turkish rulers between the years 1915 and 1923.

The Armenian genocide is an event where remembrance brings grief and horror to people the world over. Unfortunately, this year, that observance has been marred by politics within our own State Department.

Recently, I was pleased to join with our esteemed colleague from California, TONY COELHO, in sponsoring House Joint Resolution 247, which would have designated April 24, 1984, as "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man." The measure had 228 cosponsors and was assured of passage. But the measure has been tabled at the request of our State Department, which believed its approval would muck up our relations with Turkey.

In an official statement, the State Department said that "the resolution could unintentionally encourage extremist groups which have carried out a terrorist campaign against the Turkish Government and people."

Unofficially, the State Department went on to say it felt the resolution was inappropriate because the Armenian genocide has never been documented.

Mr. Speaker, every President since Woodrow Wilson has acknowledged the Turkish massacre of the Armenian people. I just do not see the State Department's logic that the remembrance of this tragedy will result in terrorist acts. We cannot sanitize this blot on the history of man by hiding our heads in the sand and saying that it never happened. The U.S. National Archives is loaded with material documenting the premeditated extermina-

tion of the Armenian people by the Ottoman government and attempts by the American Government at the time to intercede on behalf of the beleaguered Armenian nation.

In fact, the American people, through the efforts of an organization known as the Near East Relief, which was chartered by Congress, contributed some \$113 million between 1915 and 1930 to aid the Armenian genocide survivors. In addition, 132,000 Armenian orphans became foster children of American families.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to be a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 148 in 1975 which set aside April 24 as "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man." That resolution won speedy approval in both the House and Senate. It is my hope that the current administration will withdraw its objections to this most worthwhile remembrance.

It is my prayer that this tribute to the brave Armenian people will serve as a reminder of the need for an increased effort on the part of all nations to seek a just and lasting peace throughout the world. Events like the genocide against the Armenian people must never be allowed to happen again.

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 69th anniversary of the beginning of the tragic genocide that was perpetrated upon the Armenian people between 1915 and 1923. I join with my colleague CHIP PASHAYAN in his special order today with a sense of sorrow and dismay as we reflect upon this great calamity and as we pay tribute to the martyrs of the Armenian genocide.

During World War I, the Ottoman Empire had suffered defeat at the hands of the Russians in northeastern Turkey. By 1915, the Ottoman authorities began fearing that the Armenians would act as a fifth column within Turkey by supporting the Russians and their allies. The Ottoman government subsequently ordered a mass deportation of Armenians. The Armenian people were not only deported and robbed of their lands and possessions, but they were also subjected to cold-blooded massacres and atrocities and brutal extermination.

During the 5-year span of this genocide, 1.5 million Armenians died, 500,000 were exiled and countless survivors witnessed the atrocities perpetrated upon their families, relatives, and friends. These survivors still carry with them the memory and the scars of this tragedy. Males were separated from their families and massacred while the remaining women, children, and elderly were forced to march across Asia Minor to the Syrian Desert. Of these marchers, thousands died en route of starvation, disease, and exposure.

The most glaring aspect of this entire tragedy is the fact that the Turkish Government still continues to deny that this genocide ever occurred. The deaths of 1.5 million Armenians are explained away as the result of years of civil strife in the region. This denial of history that has been documented by survivors, eyewitnesses, and correspondents, including Henry Morgenthau, the American Ambassador to Turkey in 1915, can only be detrimental to our determination to prevent such a tragedy from ever occurring in the future.

Despite the historic amnesia of the Turkish Government, it is our responsibility to preserve the memory of this tragedy. For this reason, I cosponsored House Joint Resolution 247, introduced by Representative TONY COELHO, which calls for the designation of April 24 as a "National Day of Recognition of Man's Inhumanity to Man" as a day of remembrance of the Armenian genocide. I am also proud to have cosponsored House Resolution 171, offered by Representative HENRY A. WAXMAN and Representative CHIP PASHAYAN, calling on our Government to officially acknowledge the genocide.

It is only with the constant reminder of tragedies such as the Armenian genocide, the Ukrainian famine, and the Jewish Holocaust that future tragedies can be prevented. We owe it to not only the memories of the martyred Armenians, but also to the survivors and to future generations to continue our vigilance and insure that this tragic chapter of the history of mankind is never again forgotten or ignored.●

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, today we recall the tragic events of 69 years ago when the Government of Turkey, using the excuse of wartime necessity, systematically and purposefully instituted a campaign of genocide against the Armenian nation. This horrible crime against humanity became the opening chapter in this century's murderous course that brought us and the whole world shame and sorrow.

It is not only the horror of this crime that confronts us on this dark anniversary, but also the scandal of continued lies and attempts to deny the truth of this shameful atrocity by the nation that was responsible for these events. The memory of the dead 2 million still lives in the hearts of those who survived this murderous onslaught and in the hearts of the thousands of orphans who were brought to this country in the aftermath of the slaughter. They know and objective history knows that this crime occurred and all of the hired public relations experts and continued lies will not bury this truth. The repeated denials of these well documented crimes of the Ottoman Turkish regime call to mind the Nazi maxim that a big lie if often repeated becomes truth. Hitler

himself cited the Armenian massacres as evidence that humanity cares nothing for the murder of a people. We cannot and shall not accept these distortions of history that deny the humanity of those who perished in the fires of hatred and bigotry in Armenia, Ionia, and Syria during World War I.

It is a responsibility to our children and to ourselves never to allow the memory of these victims to fade away. We cannot permit the expedient policy of those concerned about relations with the current Turkish regime to turn us from these truths. We must make our condemnation of these atrocities a living memorial to their memory.●

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for reserving this time to remember the Armenian genocide of 1915.

Few things are more puzzling than the tendency of modern man to disbelieve or look away from the horrors and atrocities that man has perpetrated on his fellow man. In some cases, it is the result of ignorance, willful or not. In some cases, it is a result of a desire to avoid discomforting conclusions about the character of some of the governments with which we share this planet.

But there can be no doubt that this ignorance of history's darker events aids those who perpetrate them, and those who would do so in the future. It is known that Hitler cited the fact that the Armenian genocide was little known, little discussed and little remembered in his time. We can only imagine the conclusions he drew from this fact.

Likewise, we can only imagine the conclusions today's tyrants draw from the fact that the massacres that took place a few years ago in Cambodia drew so little of the world's attention and so little condemnation.

The conclusion we should draw is clear. Our obligation is to learn the truth about these crimes, record them in our history, and never forget them. This is the least we can do to honor the memory of the victims, and to prevent future holocausts from occurring.

This need is especially pressing in the case of the Armenian genocide, because there is such a concerted effort being made to deny the fact that it occurred. Yet there are historical accounts, eyewitness reports, newspaper reports, diplomatic messages, and other sources of definitive evidence which prove that this crime against the Armenian people did take place.

The policy of the United States should be to remember this genocide and all others that have occurred through history. Therefore, in addition to discussions such as this one in Congress, it should be our Nation's policy to commemorate the Armenian genocide in a special day of national remembrance.●

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, today, as we have each year for the last 14 years, the House sets aside time in recognition of Armenian Martyrs' Day.

To me, this is a unique day on the calendar.

It is not a holiday, to mark with fireworks and patriotic speeches and bunting.

It is not merely a day of mourning—although that is one reason we observe April 24.

It is a day on which all the people of this world should pause to reflect on that most heinous of all crimes that man can visit upon man—genocide.

This is called Remembrance Day. That which we fail to remember, we are doomed to repeat. Around the world, few paid attention in those days of World War I when the Turkish Government moved to eliminate the Armenian people from the face of the Earth. Two decades later, when Adolf Hitler was planning the elimination of the Jewish people, he is reported to have said, "Who remembers the Armenians?" The answer, regrettably, was that only the survivors remembered. Hitler's question, however, tells us that we must all—especially those of us who are not Armenians—mark this Remembrance Day each year so that when another budding Hitler asks that question, the world will shout back: "We do!"

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed that there are some in this world who deny that the horrors of the genocide of Armenians ever occurred. This compounds the crime.

It is, first of all, an insult to all those who perished at the hands of a blood-thirsty regime. It is an offense that makes the memorials of Martyr's Day all that more heart wrenching. To be murdered is one thing; to dismiss the murder as an unfortunate accident is but to compound the horror of the murder.

Second, it sets the stage for a repetition. As with the question posed by Hitler, the denial that there was any genocide begs others to commit the crime again, secure in the knowledge that they can get away with it.

There are people today who are trying to say that there was no genocide of Armenians, that those Armenians who died simply suffered the same unpleasantness that befell many in the disruptive course of the First World War.

But this was no unfortunate byproduct of warfare. This was a conscious, vicious, murderous conspiracy to eliminate the Armenian people. Listen to the words of Henry Morgenthau, our Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire. In his cable to the Secretary of State dated July 10, 1915, he said:

Persecution of Armenians assuming unprecedented proportions. . . . These measures are not in response to popular or fanati-

cal demand but are purely arbitrary and directed from Constantinople in the name of military necessity, often in districts where no military operations are likely to take place. . . . There seems to be a systematic plan to crush the Armenian race.

Some say that Ambassador Morgenthau was misled and that his reports are inaccurate. Yet the Turkish Government of the postwar era itself recognized the crime that had been committed. For example, in an interview carried in the London press December 6, 1918, Sultan Mohammad VI acknowledged the brutalities committed upon the Armenians, expressed sorrow at what had happened and pledged, "Justice will soon be done and we will never have a repetition of these ugly events."

And judicial action was taken, to a degree. For example, on April 12, 1919, Kemal Bey, the wartime minister of food, was publicly hanged in an Istanbul square after being convicted of taking a leading role in the deportations and massacre of Armenians in the Yozghad district. He was but one of a number of Turkish officials tried beginning in February of that year. The prosecutor at that trial said it was necessary for Turkey to punish the authors of the massacre.

So, we need not take only Ambassador Morgenthau's word about the reality of the genocide. We have the acknowledgment of the Turkish regime, including the Sultan himself, that a tragedy was inflicted upon the Armenian people. Why, then, is there now an effort to cover up the truth, to rewrite history—to tell us not to remember? Remember we must. Not only on April 24, but throughout the year.

The Armenian people suffered greatly. The unspeakable horrors to which they were subjected in those early years of the 20th century showed what terror can be inflicted when the powers of the modern state and the modern military are united with the will to do evil. We saw it again in Nazi Germany, and under the Khmer Rouge regime in Cambodia, and with Idi Amin in Uganda, and under Stalin's purges.

Have we learned?

I fear we have not. In just this last decade, perhaps one-third of the population of Equatorial Guinea was killed when its President, Francisco Macias Nguema, went mad. Yet how many of us even know that there is such a country as Equatorial Guinea, let alone that before Nguema was overthrown in 1979 he was killing his own people for the crime of being literate.

We remember today the 1½ million Armenians massacred in World War I and the half million driven into exile. We remember their suffering. We remember the cries of anguish, the tears of terror-stricken innocents. We remember because it is our responsibility, our duty to those who suffered so

mightily. We remember because it is our prayer that this must not happen again, that mankind must not inflict such suffering on fellow man.

We remember today.

We will remember tomorrow.

We must remember every day. ●

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, yet another year has passed in which the present Turkish Government has steadfastly refused to admit that the death of 1.5 million Armenians beginning in 1915 was no accident, thereby failing to take the first step toward genuine acceptance of Turkey in the civilized human community. Unless and until the Turkish Government of today shows enough courage to acknowledge the brutal cowardice with which the Ottoman Government of yesterday butchered Armenian women and children, it cannot hope to take its place among the civilized nations of the world. Otherwise, Turkey will remain known as the country to which Hitler looked for his ideas.

Presently in the Congress there are two resolutions pending to affirm the existence of the genocide, House Resolution 171 and Senate Resolution 241. It is imperative that these measures pass the Congress, in order for the American people to officially assert that the slaughter did occur, was deliberate, and will not soon be forgotten.

Silence on the part of the Turkish Government fixes open a wound which invites people of conscience to wrongfully condone new acts of violence, and brings the odium due their Ottoman ancestors down upon the Turkish people of today. Silence in the American State Department is already disturbingly evident. It is intolerable for the American people, as represented by this Congress, to appear at all sympathetic to the wholly indefensible position of the Turkish Government. It is our solemn duty to keep the perfidious conduct of the Ottoman authorities and the untold suffering of the Armenian people in the forefront of humanity's collective consciousness particularly in the fact of cowardly Turkish refusal to even acknowledge the inhumane policies of their ancestors. ●

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I commend my distinguished colleague from California for reserving this time to enable us to participate in this Special Order commemorating Armenian Martyrs' Day. It was on this day 69 years ago that the genocide of the Armenian people began.

The Armenian genocide started with the roundup by the Ottoman Turkish Government of Armenian community leaders and intellectuals in Istanbul. These people were then summarily executed in cold blood. Another bloody chapter in the story of man's inhumanity to man had commenced. Before it was over, 1½ million Armeni-

ans were systematically and brutally slaughtered in a rampage that lasted from 1915 to 1917.

Although this slaughter was unprecedented in modern times, it went largely ignored by the world. Certainly there were reports of the heinous deeds being committed, but, as it seems with other systematic, mass murders, little if anything was done to stop it from happening. But it did happen, and we must not forget that it did.

The survivors of the Armenian genocide to this day suffer not only the traumatic scars of seeing their families and loved ones cruelly tortured and murdered, but they and their children suffer the indignity of having every Turkish Government deny the atrocities committed in 1915. Not only that, but the Turkish Government has hired an American public relations firm as part of its attempt to convince the American people that the Armenian genocide never took place at all. They even go so far as to claim that more Turks died at the hands of Armenians than the other way around. This is a cruel and sadistic revision of history and goes against eyewitness accounts of the horrors committed. It is in complete contradiction to all the historical documents found in U.S. archives, as well as archives of other governments around the world.

We have heard the word "genocide" spoken often in this Chamber, and its meaning never ceases to conjure up visions of heinous and horrific deeds. The problems created by the Armenian genocide are as great today as they were 69 years ago, and the Armenian question is still one to which solutions have not been found. As a result of the genocide, Armenians are spread throughout the world in diaspora. In countries where they are a Christian minority, they are in a delicate position, and their human rights are denied in others.

The memory of the Armenian genocide and its historical importance must be kept alive, and we must reject any attempts to bury it in the sands of history or in the subterfuge of contemporary public relations campaigns.

For these reasons I am especially appreciative of the opportunity to participate in this special order on such an important subject. ●

● Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today we mourn the massacre of 1½ million Armenians and the deportation of 500,000 other Armenians between 1915 and 1923.

Sixty-nine years ago, on April 24, 1915, the leaders of the Turkish Government began the systematic extermination of the Armenian people. On that date, over 200 Armenian religious, political and intellectual leaders were arrested in Constantinople and in Armenian centers throughout the Otto-

man Empire. These pillars of the Armenian community were then either deported or taken to the interior and murdered, thus leaving the Armenian people leaderless and setting the stage for barbaric genocide.

Earlier in that year, the Armenians in the armed forces, who were all able-bodied Armenian males, had been segregated into labor battalions, disarmed, and ultimately worked to death or massacred. In May 1915, the Turks ordered the deportation of all Armenians. The resulting death march, consisting mostly of women, children, and elderly, wound its way across Asia Minor and Turkish Armenia into the Syrian desert. The Turks inflicted countless gruesome atrocities upon the defenseless Armenians. From rape, to drowning, to hideous torture, the Armenians suffered at the hands of their tormentors. The roads were strewn with Armenian bodies. The rivers were red with Armenian blood.

Henry Morgenthau, the U.S. Ambassador to Turkey from 1913-16 had no question that the Turkish treatment of Armenians was part of a deliberate plan of extermination. He wrote in 1918, "When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well, and, in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal the fact." Morgenthau, who tried so desperately to stop the senseless slaughter, asserted that the horrible events in Turkey "surpass the most beastly and diabolical cruelties ever before perpetrated or imagined in the history of the world."

Yet successive Turkish Governments, in an attempt to rewrite history, have tried to cover up this clear case of genocide by denying its very existence.

We join today to proclaim with a united voice that we shall never forget, that history cannot be rewritten, that in order to avoid atrocities in the future, we must always remember the atrocities of the past.

Adolf Hitler took advantage of the world's amnesia, looking at the Armenian genocide as a precedent for his own Holocaust perpetrated against Europe's Jews. Hitler said, in a chilling remark made in 1939, "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"

We must speak today of the annihilation of the Armenians. We must speak today of the extermination of the Jews. We must speak today and always of any crime committed against humanity.

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues in this special order commemorating the Armenian genocide committed by the Ottoman Turkish Government from 1915 to 1923. We pause today to mourn the death of those who lost

their lives to this senseless violence and to reaffirm our commitment to the observance of human rights for all peoples.

April 24, 1915, marked the beginning of an 8-year reign of terror as the Ottoman Government rounded up and summarily executed Armenian community leaders. What followed was the systematic and brutal extermination of more than 1½ million Armenians between 1915 and 1917. Shootings, drownings, torture, and starvation became commonplace in this assault on the Armenian race.

Henry Morgenthau, U.S. Ambassador to Turkey from 1913 to 1916, has vividly recorded the tragedy of Armenia:

Homes were literally uprooted; families were separated; men killed; women and girls violated daily on the way or taken to harems. Children were thrown into rivers or sold to strangers by their mothers to save them from starvation. The facts contained in the reports received at the Embassy from absolutely trustworthy eye-witnesses surpass the most beastly and diabolical cruelties ever perpetrated or imagined in the history of the world.

Sadly, however, the Armenian genocide would be surpassed by the Nazi holocaust in the 1930's and 1940's. Adolf Hitler, in an attempt to explain away his maniacal slaughter, would ask with a laugh: "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"

Today, we all speak of the Armenian genocide in hope that universal outrage will prevent such a horror from recurring. To forget this tragic chapter in human history is to tacitly accept it. And that we must not do. The genocides of this century have made it painfully clear that in order to avoid repeating these tragedies, we must never let their memories fade.

Our annual Armenian genocide commemoration, while emotionally trying for those who still bear its scars, tells the world in no uncertain terms that such barbarity will be condemned, and we all pray, averted for eternity.

● Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today we recognize Armenian Martyrs' Day in memory of the men, women, and children whose lives were lost during a genocide which began on this date 69 years ago. Congressman CHARLES PASHAYAN, JR., is responsible for organizing this opportunity, and I commend him for doing so.

The murder of 1.5 million Armenians was the first genocide of the 20th century. Many of the survivors are still alive, and rightly remind us of the importance of remembering this tragedy. Forgetting such atrocities encourages history to repeat itself. We who are concerned about human rights owe it to our Armenian friends to remember and to prevent further such events.

There are those who maintain that the Armenian genocide never oc-

curred, even though this destruction is well documented in the archives of many nations, including the United States. A million and a half Armenians were exterminated, an additional 500,000 were deported, and their 3,000-year presence was eliminated from their historic homeland. The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council has affirmed our country's recognition of these historic facts by including the Armenian genocide in its museum and educational programs. We must not allow those who deny this event to prevail and create further tragedies.

We are fortunate to live in a free land which has benefited from the contributions of many cultures. Our lives are constantly enriched by the presence of Armenians and other nationalities in our society. We recognize the human rights of all peoples, both at home and abroad. The most extreme violation of human rights is the deliberate attempt to exterminate an entire race, an intent that is almost unbelievable to us and yet has been tried on more than one occasion in history. How much poorer the world would be had these attempts been successful.

It is critical that we take this opportunity to recognize our Armenian brothers and sisters and recommit ourselves to the prevention of terrorist threats and acts wherever and whenever they might occur.

● Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, today, April 24, 1984, marks the 69th anniversary of the beginning of one of the darkest chapters of the 20th century—the planned destruction of the Armenian people by the Ottoman Empire. This tragic campaign of massacre and starvation was only the first of its kind in our modern and civilized 20th century; but that very fact requires that it be recognized, remembered, and condemned as strongly as other genocidal efforts in the modern world.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the actions of the Ottoman Government did not lead directly to the forced starvation of the Ukraine by Josef Stalin, the gas chambers of Auschwitz, the gruesome slaughter of the Cambodians, Idi Amin's death campaign in Uganda, and the more recent actions in Mtabeland in Zimbabwe, but I know that human nature, even a warped and infamous human nature, needs the comfort of believing that it can get away with something before it proceeds. As an example I would cite Adolf Hitler's statement concerning his final solution for the Jews of Europe when he said, "who now remembers the Armenians?" If more proof is needed then we can all look up Idi Amin's frequent statements of his adoration for Adolf Hitler as a man who knew how to handle a problem.

The Armenian genocide is not a fantasy. It is a fact and it was deliberate.

The other examples that I have cited are also facts and they were all planned and implemented by supposedly legitimate governments. This type of action is the product of insanity, but the fact that it still occurs and is occurring today can be laid directly at the feet of everyone in the world who does not rise up in indignation to let madmen know that they can never get away with atrocities and massacres and forced starvation of their own people.

We in the greatest Nation on Earth must share responsibility for not preventing these heinous events from taking place and I, for one, will always think about and pray for the souls of all of those people who have been murdered because of their race or nationality. Mr. Speaker, I most sincerely ask that my colleagues join me in remembering the people of Armenia on this infamous day.●

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am most honored to join my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. PASHAYAN), in today's special order commemorating the anniversary of the Armenian genocide of 1915-23. There is little need for justifying today's special order, as observance of "Armenian Genocide Day" has long been a historical fact recognized by successive administrations of American Presidents. I am proud to be a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 247, which would designate April 24 as a solemn day of commemoration for victims of the Armenian Genocide and other incidents of gross inhumanity and barbarism.

Likewise, I am a cosponsor of House Resolution 171 which affirms recognition by the Congress of the indisputable facts of the genocide. It is inconceivable to me that the State Department has seen fit to actively oppose enactment of House Joint Resolution 247 because of some vague fear that our NATO ally Turkey will look with disfavor on this legislation. Since when has that mentality been the basis for American foreign policy?

Surely it is not appropriate, given the principles held dear by our people, or the long-standing U.S. policy of recognizing the genocide committed against the Armenian people by the Turks as historical fact. I trust the Armenian-American community will look upon today's most timely special order as a fitting commemoration for the victims of the Armenian genocide, and be assured that this Congress has repeatedly reaffirmed the genocide as unambiguous historical fact.●

● Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, 69 years ago today the world's first genocide of a Christian people began. During the years of horror that ensued between 1915 and 1923, 1.5 million Armenians lost their lives and countless millions lost their homes. As a result of the Ottoman

government's persecution, Armenians are spread throughout the world in diaspora. I am fortunate to have one of the largest Armenian populations in the world in my district.

Clearly, no amount of congressional special orders will bring back those innocent men, women, and children who lost their lives. Now, however, the Armenians are battling a far more intangible, yet equally devastating evil. Despite the United States honorable attempts to prevent this tragedy, and our efforts to assist those who survived, the State Department no longer explicitly recognizes this genocide and refuses to clearly state their policy position on the matter.

The Armenian Genocide is an historical fact. To deny that fact is to deny also the volume of materials documenting the Armenian genocide as well as the extent of American intervention to prevent the full realization of diabolical plans to exterminate Armenians. Americans donated millions of dollars and adopted thousands of Armenian orphans between 1915 and 1930 in their efforts to mitigate the gruesome effects wrought by the Ottomans. Virtually every U.S. President since this event has condemned the genocide, as has the United States Congress.

Let us not turn our backs on this abundance of evidence. It is not for the State Department of the greatest democracy in the world to attempt to rewrite history. We should leave that to other less scrupulous political entities.

For the sake of the millions of Armenians, dead and living, who suffered beyond belief at the hands of the Ottomans, I urge the State Department to withdraw their silent denial of this genocide. This issue does not belong in the realm of current policy and its potential implication on U.S./Turkish relations. Foreign policy negotiations should not interfere with the seemingly simple matter of acknowledging an unfortunate event supported by the truth of history.

Richard Cohen stated in the Washington Post on May 31, 1983, that, "The last victim of any genocide is truth." America has a history of standing up for truth, human rights, and the inviolability of history. I sincerely hope that Congress can do as much today.●

● Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support my colleague from California in giving recognition to the plight of the Armenian people, on April 24, Armenian Martyrs' Day. For too long the massacre of over 1.5 million Armenian nationals has been ignored by most of the world. In fact, our own relations with Turkey have led to certain pressures to ignore the deaths of this minority group.

The virtual elimination of Armenians from their ancestral homeland in

modern day Turkey is an example of forced extermination of an entire people and their culture. As a country which cherishes democracy and freedom, we must fight to oppose any future genocide and fight to give proper recognition to those whose lives were sacrificed basically because of religious and ethnic prejudice. I commend the gentleman on this special order and I hope that he will continue to remind us that the plight of the Armenian people must not be forgotten.●

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, April 24, 1984, marks the 14th time we here in Congress have recognized Armenian Martyrs' Day in memory of the 1.5 million Christian men, women, and children who died between 1915 and 1923, at the hands of the "Young Turk" government.

It was the mobilization for World War I that set the stage for the tragic genocide of thousands of Christian Armenians. By February of 1915, the Turkish Government had already begun to segregate Armenians into labor battalions, as well as disarming and deporting countless others. On April 24, 1915, about 200 Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were arrested in Istanbul and were either exiled or murdered. Similar measures were carried out throughout the Ottoman Empire in all Armenian centers. This carnage continued for several years despite efforts in the United States to end the atrocities through diplomatic pressures and by expressing to Turkey a deep sense of concern and outrage. By 1923, 1.5 million Armenians had perished, and more than 500,000 were exiled from their homes in the Ottoman Empire.

Unfortunately the Armenian genocide is a historical fact. By remembering this dark chapter in human history we not only honor those who perished, but we also express our abhorrence for all forms of physical violence against innocent human lives—be it in the form of genocide or terrorism and be it in 1915 or today.

As citizens of a nation that was founded on the principles of personal and religious freedom we are obligated to take notice of any abrogation of these precious liberties both past and present. As we commemorate those who perished in the Armenian genocide we also reaffirm our dedication to the principles of personal and religious freedom, and our commitment to promoting peace and liberty throughout the world.●

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, during the years from 1915 to 1923 over 2 million Armenian citizens of the Ottoman Turkish Empire were systematically driven from their homeland of 3,000 years. While 500,000 of these Armenians found safety in other parts of the world, the majority, 1.5 million, per-

ished in forced marches and massacres. Thus, the Armenian community in Turkey, which at the beginning of World War I numbered approximately 2.5 million, now consists of fewer than 100,000 people. Today we observe Armenian Martyrs' Day in remembrance of the tragedy of the Armenian genocide.

The persecution of the Armenians in Turkey is amply documented in the Archives of the United States and in those of other countries. At the time of the Armenian genocide, then-U.S. Ambassador to Turkey Henry Morgenthau sent back numerous reports detailing atrocities committed against the Armenian people. In his autobiography, Mr. Morgenthau wrote that:

The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915.

More recently, both Presidents Reagan and Carter commented on the tragedy of the Armenian genocide. Following this lead, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council unanimously resolved that the Armenian genocide should be remembered in the Holocaust Museum Memorial. In addition to U.S. recognition of the Armenian genocide, the United Nations has also noted the extensive documentation of the massacres of Armenians in Turkey in the early part of this century.

Unfortunately, successive Turkish governments have never admitted that these horrible events took place. Even today, Turkish officials resolutely deny that any atrocities were committed against the Armenian people. The Turkish Government claims that any Armenian deaths occurred as part of a civil war within a global war. After Armenian Martyrs' Day last year, I received a letter from the Turkish Ambassador to the United States, implying that by seeking to establish the historical validity of the Armenian genocide I "hold Turkish lives of little importance" and "give Armenian terrorists more encouragement." These allegations are astounding. I do not condone the acts of Armenian terrorist groups; I am sure that most Armenians do not either. The Ambassador's comments are merely another attempt to avoid the issue we have raised, the acknowledgment of the truth of the Armenian genocide. Our goal is peaceful: to insure that such a tragedy never occurs again.

It is necessary that we remember this terrible event and defend the principle of the inviolability of history. The Armenian people have survived and prospered, and should be commended for their courage and perseverance. After the massacres, the Armenians were dispersed around the world, yet in every country, and especially in our country, they have contributed much to their communities while maintaining their proud herit-

age. Mr. Speaker, I join in today in honoring the spirit of the Armenian people, and I join them in remembering the millions who died so needlessly. In gathering for the 14th time to recall the Armenian genocide, we perform a duty demanded by Elie Wiesel when he said: "to forget is to make oneself an accomplice of the executioner."

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for reserving this special order that we might pause and remember the Armenian tragedy from 1915 to 1923. For the few survivors, the memories will last forever. In fact, we must insure that these memories do remain, so that mankind will not repeat again these unthinkable acts.

I have found that most students, when pondering the relevance of their school subjects, question the need to study history. The merits of studying reading, math, science and geography appear much more apparent to them, yet they question the benefits of knowing what happened in the past: how nations were formed and governed, the causes and results of conflict, and the recurring desires of a few to dominate many. Yet every scholar of the subject can detail countless times when humans have failed to learn the lessons of history and have stumbled down the same tragic paths which led to the destruction of their predecessors, and eventually to their own.

Even Adolf Hitler used past events to shape his own policies. In 1939 as he was beginning his invasion of Poland, Hitler ordered the mass extermination of its inhabitants, commenting "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?" Humanity's failure to remember the genocide of an entire people scarcely 25 years earlier gave Hitler the go-ahead to exterminate millions of innocent people.

Every Turkish Government has systematically denied the brutal torture and murder of 1.5 million Armenians and the horrible displacement of an entire population. They have tried to persuade the American people that the genocide was simply a myth. Yet we know what happened and it is only through knowing and remembering such atrocities that we can prevent future mass exterminations. We naively believe that such a thing could never happen today. The facts tell us that history which is not recalled is repeated, as Hitler did in Germany. And if we scrutinize what is happening today—in 1984—we will notice on a smaller scale many of the same atrocities: death squads, routine violations of individual and collective human rights, religious persecution, and government-sponsored terrorism. Many of these activities are carried out by extremists, yet numerous are the prod-

ucts of friends of the United States. Must we remain victims again of so much forgotten history?

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with so many of my colleagues to commemorate the anniversary of a sad and tragic moment in the history of the world—the massacre of some 1.5 million men, women, and children of Armenian descent by the forces of the Ottoman Empire.

It was on April 24, 1915, that the killing began in what we have come to realize was only the first of the 20th-century's attempts at genocide, the slaughter of groups of people by governments bent on obliterating them.

This day serves to remind us that this first genocide of our century served as a precedent for the Holocaust of World War II when more than 6 million innocent people were destroyed by a government whose leader responded: "Whoever cared about the Armenians?" when it was suggested that world opinion would not allow the Nazis to get away with their attempt to eliminate the Jewish people.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that this day is necessary. We should not have to have a day set aside to remind us of the Armenian martyrs, of man's inhumanity to man. This day in 1915 and the days that followed should be so permanently inscribed on our consciousness that they need no reminders.

But the sad truth is that we do sometimes forget. Even worse, there are those who deny the evidence that this massacre even occurred. The Government of modern-day Turkey continues to deny the truth; it denies the evidence of death and destruction, denies the reports by witnesses who reported the massacres of innocents.

There are even some in our own Government who wish to rewrite history and seek to deny the eyewitness reports of their predecessors and wish to revise the record passed down to us by experienced diplomats and journalists.

The denial of the historical record contained in our own archives is something new and, to me, quite astounding. Should this be allowed to take place, where would it lead? Could it be possible that some 30 years from now there would be American officials arguing that the Nazi Holocaust did not take place?

It is because memories grow short and because there may always be some people who seek, for whatever reason of diplomatic expediency, to rewrite history that we will soon have in Washington a memorial to the victims of genocide. This Holocaust Memorial will commemorate the victims of genocide, the slaughtered innocents from Armenia, from Europe, from Asia, and from Africa.

It is also because of this that there have been introduced in Congress two resolutions which many of us cosponsored dealing directly with the Armenian tragedy. One resolution, House Joint Resolution 247, would have designated today as a "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man." Unfortunately, and inexplicably to me, this resolution, which was supported by 228 Members of this body, was objected to when it was brought before the House on April 11 for unanimous-consent approval.

A second resolution, House Resolution 171, has 135 cosponsors. It would affirm the Armenian genocide and declare it to be the sense of Congress that it is U.S. policy to embrace the tragic historical events that began 69 years ago today. I urge those of my colleagues who have not yet done so to join as cosponsors of House Resolution 171 to show the world that we do not condone the obliteration of history any more than we condone the obliteration of people.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge the Government of Turkey to recognize the role the discredited empire that was overthrown played in the massacre. The efforts by the modern Government of Turkey to deny history and to pressure this Government to ignore the murder of 1.5 million Armenians should be condemned by all of us. Turkey's denial of history is no worse than would be Germany's denial of the Holocaust.

Mr. Speaker, we should not allow Turkey to insist on perpetrating a colossal, historical hoax and we cannot allow our Government to aid and abet such a hoax. It is our duty to educate the young and the uninformed of the atrocity that began 69 years ago and to persuade those who still refuse to accept the historical truth of the annihilation of approximately half the world's Armenian population.

For these reasons we participate today in this special order and it is for these reasons that I again urge my colleagues to join in supporting House Resolution 171.

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of Armenian Martyrs' Day, it is with a sense of profound horror and indignation that we call to the attention of Congress and the American people the first genocide of the 20th century in April 1915.

During the next 7 years, over 1½ million Armenians were massacred at the hands of the Turks, effectively eliminating almost the entire Armenian community of Asia Minor and Turkish Armenia. This massacre reflected a desire to wipe out both the Armenian nation and its ancient culture. Only a few hundred thousand survived this first holocaust, escaping to Europe, the United States, Russia, and the Arab countries.

It should be a source of concern to all of us that to this day Turkey does not acknowledge, despite eyewitness accounts, either the facts or its historical responsibility; for the line from Armenia to Auschwitz is direct. The Holocaust of European Jewry has its precedence in the events of 1915 to 1922. "Who still talks nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians," Hitler told his generals on the eve of the extermination of the Jews. The horrendous events of World War II overshadowed the Armenian genocide, and it is only recently, through the peaceful efforts of Armenian groups, that the rest of the world has once again begun to recognize the collective agony of the Armenian people.

Only by recalling both of these tragedies for what they were—historical moments of unimaginable cruelty and shame—can we prevent anything like this from ever recurring.

● Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak today on the occasion of Armenian Martyrs' Day, a day to commemorate the tragedy of the massacres of 1915 to 1920. Last year I had the opportunity to participate in the special order marking this day. Repetition of those remarks is not necessary but reaffirmation is always in order.

I am aware of the sensitivities of our ally Turkey to the events we commemorate. I am also aware of the need for prudence and balance in dealing with the complexities of relationships with allies. But I believe that those relationships should not obscure the need to continue to bear active witness to genocide, wherever it occurred. That is why I join again in this annual day of remembrance, Armenian Martyrs' Day.

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children who lost their lives at the hands of Turkish authorities from 1915 to 1923. This special order provides a unique opportunity for us to recall the Armenian genocide, which we must not allow to escape from the public mind. Given the sad history of genocide in this century, it is important that all of us take whatever steps we can, both collectively and as individuals, to insure that this piece of history is preserved.

An even more compelling reason for today's special order arises because the perpetrators of this crime have consistently attempted to deny the truth about the Armenian genocide. This kind of appalling historical revisionism must not be tolerated. The truth is certainly harsh, but it is undeniable. Archives throughout the world fully record the sickening events which took place. The Armenians living under the domain of the Ottoman Empire were deported and sent to slave-labor camps. Many perished

there, while others survived only long enough to be massacred by the thousands as the world looked on.

As a Jew, I feel a sense of personal responsibility to make certain that this issue does not become blurred as a result of these insidious attempts to deny the facts; there are individuals on this Earth who similarly seek to deny the facts of the atrocities committed against the Jews by Adolf Hitler. It seems that there is a propensity to obscure the history of such terrible events because of guilt or political expediency, or perhaps because of the unwavering hatred toward the victims of these crimes. No matter what the underlying motivation may be, it is our obligation to speak the truth.

As a cosponsor of House Resolution 171 and House Joint Resolution 247, both of which recognize the significance of this tragedy, I firmly believe that today's special order reflects the commitment of this House to maintaining an accurate record of the Armenian genocide. We can ill afford to forget this horror; for it is when the world neglects to recount such events that similar atrocities are committed by hostile regimes who exercise their authority through the wanton destruction of powerless minorities.

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 69th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Each year Members of this body observe and mark this occasion on the floor of the House. It is important that we not ignore this event, lest we allow one of the testaments to mankind's capacity for evil to slip into the shadows of history.

The Armenian nation, under the control of the Ottoman Empire, was the object of a systematic and organized effort of genocide. Over 1½ million Armenians died in what has come to represent the first event of this century whereby a sovereign state sought to destroy an entire race of people.

In speaking of the consequences of the Jewish Holocaust, Adolf Hitler once remarked: "Who remembers the Armenians?" Indeed it is our responsibility to do just that; remember that which we would rather choose to forget. The Armenian genocide stands as one of the great tragedies of the modern age; an omen of a new era in which man's social and technological advancement is accompanied by a growing list of barbaric atrocities.

Our remembrance of the Armenian genocide should not be an event of token homage, it must be regarded with energy and passion. It is our responsibility to be on vigilant guard for all crimes against humanity and all abuses of human rights. It is our solemn duty to speak out against such injustice and act to end it.

I welcome the opportunity to join my colleagues today in marking this tragic event and speaking out in the

hopes that events like it not occur again.●

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating Armenian Martyrs' Day. The record is clear, the facts compelling and tragic. The Armenian race has been singularly persecuted by the Ottoman government, culminating in a three-decade period, from 1894 to 1924 during which Armenians were systematically uprooted from their homeland of 3,000 years and eliminated through massacre or exile.

The extent of this persecution is dramatically illustrated by statistics. Some 2.5 million Armenians were living in the Ottoman Empire at the beginning of World War I. Since the Armenian genocide, fewer than 100,000 declared Armenians reside in Turkey. The deaths of over 1.5 million Armenians are directly attributed to the genocide.

Deportations and massacres of Armenians were commonplace, indeed these policies represented an official strategy to take care of the Armenian question during the early 20th century. An edict of deportation was formally promulgated on May 27, 1915, leading to the deportation of Armenians throughout the empire. Men were usually separated from the group and massacred. The remaining women, children, and elderly were marched across Asia Minor and Turkish Armenia to the Syrian Desert. Those who managed to escape starvation, kidnapping, disease, or death by exposure were few indeed.

On August 4, 1915, Mr. Speaker, the New York Times reported that the Turks, after massacring all the males of the population in the region of Bitlis, assembled 9,000 women and children and drove them to the banks of the Tigris River, where they shot them and threw the bodies into the river; 2 weeks later Mr. Speaker, the New York Times printed another story on the massacre, containing a copy of a letter from Constantinople which vividly described the terrible plight of the Armenian people during these dark times. I would like to share the contents of that letter with my colleagues.

We now know with certainty from a reliable source that the Armenians have been deported in a body from all the towns and villages in Cilicia to the desert regions south of Aleppo. The refugees will have to traverse on foot a distance, requiring marches of from one to two or even more months.

We learn, besides, that the roads and the Euphrates are strewn with the corpses of exiles, and those who survive are doomed to certain death, since they will find neither house, work, nor food in the desert. It is a plan to exterminate the whole Armenian people.

Courts-martial operate everywhere without cessation. Twelve Armenians were hanged at Caesarea on a charge of having obeyed instructions which they had received from a meeting secretly held in Bucharest

by the Trochak and Hunchak societies. Many have fallen from blows from clubs. Thirteen Armenians were killed in this way at Diarbekr and six at Caesarea. Thirteen others were killed on their way from Chabine-Karahissar to Sivas. The priests of the village of Kurk with their five companions suffered the same fate on the road to Sou-Cheheksivas although they had their hands bound.

Hundreds of women and young girls and even children groan in prisons. Churches and convents have been pillaged, defiled, and destroyed. The villages around Van and Bitlis have been pillaged and inhabitants put to the sword.

At the beginning of this month all the inhabitants of Karahissar were pitilessly massacred, with the exception of a few children.

Mr. Speaker, we must not forget the suffering of the Armenian race during this frightening period of their 3,000-year history. I commend the efforts of the Armenian National Committee to heighten national and international awareness of these sad events and sincerely pray that we will take this lesson to heart. We must never allow history to repeat itself in the form of a deliberate and brutal campaign of persecution and genocide. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that by remembering the tragic events of the Armenian genocide through Armenian Martyrs' Day, we might prevent such heinous and flagrant violations of human rights from being duplicated.●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material, on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have permission to precede the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) with my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL UNDERCUTTING OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, this is the special order on congressional undercutting of American foreign policy and the problems of legislative-executive-constitutional rights.

I want to proceed by talking about my thoughts on this topic and then yielding commensurate time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ), a very distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Then, after that, I would engage in such dialog as seems appropriate.

Earlier, since this does involve 11 other Members of the House, I had communicated by hand-delivered letters to all 11 Members' offices that they knew this was going to happen. I sent those letters yesterday.

The United States confronts a constitutional crisis over the implementation of foreign policy. That crisis is so intense and so far-reaching that Watergate is the only recent event of comparable gravity.

America is at a real crossroads in its ability to develop and implement an effective foreign policy. Either we will return to the consensus and executive branch implementation with congressional oversight, which characterized the period from Truman through Kennedy, or we will continue to decay in a period of legislative meddling and undermining, which cripples the executive branch and weakens the nation. From the mid-1960s—when the Vietnam War began destroying the consensus in American foreign policy—until today, it has become more and more acceptable for American citizens and their elected representatives to oppose and even undercut their own government in foreign relations.

Three recent events convinced me that we face a real crisis in our capacity to survive as an effective nation in a dangerous world. First, an anonymous American citizen was quoted in the press, suggesting as a reasonable response to the CIA mining of Nicaraguan harbors a course of action that, were we formally at war, could only be called treason.

Second, a U.S. congressman sent a member of his staff with a proposed report to Grenada so the anti-American government could edit the report to maximize its helpfulness to their cause.

Third, 10 members of the House of Representatives sent a letter to the Nicaraguan Marxist regime with suggestions and language which make the letter an extraordinary document that is of highly questionable legality and that poses constitutional problems of frightening dimensions.

These three cases fit into a pattern of disintegration in American foreign policy which has its roots in trips by Jane Fonda and others to Hanoi, while North Vietnamese troops were killing American boys in Southeast Asia. As American citizens arrogated to themselves the right to meet and negotiate with foreign governments, it became more and more acceptable to go overseas on the grounds that the current government was not doing enough, or it was not doing the right thing.

This passion for personal diplomacy has affected both the Republican and Democratic parties, and both liberals and conservatives. Thus, during the Iranian hostage crisis, both the conservative Republican Congressman George Hansen and the liberal Democratic former Attorney General Ramsey Clark found it reasonable and desirable to visit Tehran in pursuit of a better solution than President Carter seemed to be finding.

More recently, Democratic presidential candidate Jesse Jackson gained enormous

positive publicity while visiting the Syrian dictator Hafez Assad at a time when his forces were training and supplying terrorists in Lebanon who were killing American Marines and naval airmen. While Jackson's trip was good for the particular pilot he brought home, it was a disastrous precedent in teaching future opponents to play various American political factions off against each other.

As it has become more and more publicly acceptable to "do you own thing" in competing with the American government in foreign policy, the signals both to foreigners and to Americans have become more and more self-defeating for our country. After all, if there is no prohibition against each citizen deciding what he or she wants and then traveling overseas to discuss it with foreign governments, why pay any attention to the politician who happens to currently sit in the White House or the politicians who happen to have a majority in the House and Senate?

This tendency to have 235 million foreign policies, one for each American, reached its greatest danger point last weekend in the Sunday Atlanta Journal-Constitution in an article from Corinto, Nicaragua, by Ronnie Lovler. On Page 53A, the article concluded with a stunning paragraph worth repeating:

"Reagan administration action so angered one of the many Americans who visit here that he vowed to return to the United States to start a fund-raising campaign to buy a mine sweeper for Nicaragua. 'Now wouldn't that be the perfect irony?' he mused 'The U.S. government works to put the mines in and the U.S. public works to take them out.'"

There are two vital things wrong with that American citizen's reasoning. First in a nation of free elections in which Congress must approve and agree to pay for all foreign policy actions by the president, there can be no legitimate argument that there is a need for the members of the public to take the conduct of foreign policy into their own hands. If the people want to reject a policy, they can fire the elected officials in the next election.

"PERFECT IRONY" IS TREASON

Second, when an individual citizen decides to provide weapons and support to another government to fight his own, it is not called treason.

While that anonymous citizen's comments are outrageous, he is less to blame than the elected officials who in recent years have found it increasingly easy to ignore official foreign policy and simply undermine and undercut the United States government whenever they feel like it. After all, if elected public officials sworn to uphold the Constitution find it acceptable to weaken their government's ability to implement foreign policy why should the average citizen be worried about his or her actions?

There have been two recent congressional actions that typify this problem of conflict between the legislative and executive branches in the implementation of foreign policy. They are both worth examining.

First, Rep. Ron Dellums of California worked so closely with the Grenadian Marxist dictatorship that in some ways he represented their interests more than California. The minutes of the Grenadian dictatorship were captured when the United States liberated the island and saved the 800 American students there from becoming hostages. In addition to fascinating details such as the actual contract between the Soviet Union, Cuba, and Grenada, there are apparently a

series of references to a close working relationship between Marxist Grenada and Dellums. Reports indicate that on one occasion, Dellums sent a member of his staff to Grenada with a copy of a proposed report to the House to be reviewed and edited by the Grenadian Marxists to ensure that it provided maximum help for their side.

The notion that a member of the Armed Services Committee would work hand in glove with a Marxist dictatorship which the United States government was publicly accusing of becoming a Soviet-Cuban puppet is remarkable.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. SOLARZ. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) was not one of the 10 signers of the letter that some of us sent to Mr. Ortega in Nicaragua, which, I gathered, was the fundamental reason of the special order which the gentleman scheduled.

The gentleman was good enough to alert all of the signatories of the letter to Mr. Ortega that he was taking out this special order, and I am here today to speak on behalf of myself and, I think, some of the others.

□ 1440

But, I wonder if you also were good enough to inform the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS).

Mr. GINGRICH. Yes; we sent a letter to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SOLARZ. You are making some pretty strong accusations here, and I would hope that the gentleman would have a chance to answer for himself.

Mr. GINGRICH. We did inform him and we in fact have a standing invitation. If he is not available today, I would be glad to come at his convenience to discuss this.

I happen to have the minutes of the Grenadian Government and the reports to the Grenadian Government by their representatives, and I think it would make most useful dialog. I have another half paragraph, and I was going to then get into the letter.

I have worked it out with the timekeeper to yield you literally as much time as I take.

Mr. SOLARZ. I thank the gentleman. I want to say I would hope my silence on the question of the involvement of the gentleman from California with the previous government of Grenada should not in any way be construed as agreement with these allegations.

I am, frankly, not aware of any relationship which may have existed. Therefore, I am not in a position to comment on it.

I do think that, given the nature of these allegations, the gentleman should have an opportunity to speak for himself.

I am glad you apparently did inform him. And I assume that a copy of the RECORD will be made available to him so he can see for himself.

Mr. GINGRICH. Yes.

Mr. SOLARZ. I must just say, and then I will yield back to the gentleman the remainder of his time.

Mr. GINGRICH. Certainly.

Mr. SOLARZ. My impression based on the limited contact I have had with the gentleman from California is that he is a genuine patriot. He believes in this country. He may have a different point of view from time to time than some of the other Members, but I do not know anyone who has ever suggested that the man is not a dedicated and patriotic American.

Mr. GINGRICH. Before I resume, would you like to pursue this for a minute, because you are raising a very important point here, and I will say to you candidly, and this is part of why I take all this so seriously, and I know you and I have had a discussion on mountains and molehills and I am sure in a moment you will elaborate on that.

Mr. SOLARZ. Do not use all of my good lines. Wait until I speak.

Mr. GINGRICH. But the point I want to make here and I tried to place this in the context first of an American citizen, then of an individual Member of the Congress and then of 10 very distinguished Members and much more central to the power structure of this Congress, candidly, than the gentleman from California.

I do not suggest, and I want to say this very explicitly, I do not think that any of the Members we are talking about, and I hope you agree about my side of the aisle in the same way, have anything at heart but the best interests of this country. Not only are they certainly not traitors, certainly not trying to hurt America; they in fact are trying to help America.

The problem we face, I think it is a situation where we have two sets of difficulties; one is a philosophical, and that is for another day and the nature of the Soviet threat; nature of Marxism as tyranny; but there is another difficulty here which I think candidly my good friend from New York does not take seriously enough, and that is what are the limitations on the legislative branch in the age of the jet airport and the age of the constant cocktail party?

And I think as you will see as we develop this, I am trying to suggest I would never have jumped in as hard as I have had it remained purely fringe activities by individual Members who are more enthusiastic than wise.

But when distinguished chairmen of subcommittees and distinguished majority leaders get involved, then it becomes more central.

Mr. SOLARZ. I just want to say to the gentleman that I appreciate his putting me in the pantheon of the powerful, and I am flattered by being included in this illustrious list. I will wait for the gentleman to complete his presentation and then, with his permission, I would like to respond.

Mr. GINGRICH. Absolutely.

Mr. SOLARZ. And indicate where I think he has gone amiss.

Mr. GINGRICH. With some trepidation, since you are both powerful and persuasive, but I will certainly yield.

Let me continue then. "The idea that this same Congressman," back to the gentleman from California for just a second—

The idea that this same congressman would send his aide with a report to permit our opponents to propagandize us through official congressional reports is outlandish. The fact that Congress has done nothing to investigate this irregularity would be amazing if it were not for the second and even more stunning incident.

On March 20, 1984, 10 members of the House of Representatives wrote a letter to the Nicaraguan Marxist dictatorship declaring their opposition to United States policy and encouraging the Nicaraguan government to take steps to influence the American political process.

The "Dear Comandante" letter, as a recent Wall Street Journal editorial called it, is the most striking transgression against propriety and common sense in Washington in recent years. Its impact will be with us for years to come. It is addressed to Comandante Daniel Ortega, the leader of the Nicaraguan Marxist faction which is systematically tightening its grip on the country with Soviet and Cuban advisers, equipment and resources. Hence, its title, "Dear Comandante."

LETTER UNDERCUT U.S. POLICY

This letter is almost certainly illegal and unconstitutional on three counts. First, its authors state clearly to a foreign government that "we have been, and remain, opposed to U.S. support for military action directed against the people or government of Nicaragua." This statement crosses the bounds from legitimate opposition to American policy within the United States to a deliberate communication of that opposition to a foreign government with which we are disagreeing.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. I think what the gentleman is saying is very important, and deserves some attention.

Now you have mentioned the names of several Members involved in the subject matter; Mr. HANSEN who went over to Iran, Mr. DELLUMS. I think before you get into the substance of this letter, who are these 10 leading Members of this House, because that puts this in the proper environment. That gives it significance and salience.

So would you give us those names?

Mr. GINGRICH. Certainly, I would be glad to respond to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The gentlemen are Mr. WRIGHT, the majority leader, the gentleman from

Texas; Mr. ALEXANDER, the deputy majority whip, the gentleman from Arkansas; Mr. BARNES, of Maryland; Mr. SOLARZ, of New York; and Mr. HAMILTON of Indiana, who are subcommittee chairmen of Foreign Affairs; Mr. BOLAND, very distinguished chairman of the Intelligence Committee from Massachusetts; Mr. TORRICELLI from New Jersey and Mr. GARCIA from New York who are on the Foreign Affairs Committee; and Mr. OBEY, of Wisconsin, and Mr. McHUGH, of New York, who are on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of Appropriations.

Mr. HYDE. Would the gentleman yield? Are any of those gentlemen Republicans?

Mr. GINGRICH. No, these are all Democrats; they are all members of the majority and I think it was the fact you had three subcommittee chairmen in Foreign Affairs, two members of the subcommittee that pays for foreign operations, and the distinguished majority leader and the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, that collectively I think has to be considered, at least in foreign policy, reasonably close to a power structure for the House.

Mr. HYDE. Those are important movers and shakers.

Mr. GINGRICH. They are not random, isolated radicals; they are clearly the center of the majority Democratic Party, yes.

Mr. HYDE. And they wrote a letter to the head Sandinista in Nicaragua and they signed it; is that right?

Mr. GINGRICH. Yes. This was written on the stationery of the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HYDE. And it starts out, "Dear Comandante"; is that right?

Mr. GINGRICH. That is correct.

Mr. HYDE. Thank you. I am going to listen with great interest.

Mr. GINGRICH. In writing this sentence, these 10 Congressmen clearly, and the sentence, let me go back and say was, quote:

We have been and remain opposed to U.S. support for military action directed against the people or Government of Nicaragua.

To continue:

In writing this sentence, these 10 congressmen clearly undercut the efforts of their own government to apply pressure to the Nicaraguan regime to cease its active sponsorship of Soviet and Cuban interests and its export of revolution.

Second, the letter invites the Nicaraguan Marxists to learn how to manipulate and influence American politics. On Page 1, they assert that the Nicaraguan Marxists could weaken the Reagan administration and those conservative and moderate politicians who have supported our Central American policies. By saying that a change in Nicaraguan policy would mean that "those responsible for supporting violence against your government and for obstructing serious negotiations for broad political participation in El Salvador would have far greater difficulty winning support for their policies than they do today," the congressmen focus the

Nicaraguans on the American domestic political process.

The writers return to their theme of Nicaraguan interference in the American political system of Page 2 when they assert that a wiser Nicaraguan policy would "significantly strengthen the hands of those in our country who desire better relations based upon the true equality, self-determination and mutual good will." There is no modern example of so blatant an effort by one faction of American politicians to draw a foreign government into taking positions based on a calculation of how it would effect the balance of political power inside the United States.

This effort to educate the Marxist regime into the art of manipulating American opinion is the least unconstitutional and least illegal of the three errors in this letter. However, involving foreign governments in our political process may be the most dangerous and frightening thing these 10 congressmen proposed. If foreign governments start taking and releasing hostages, engaging and abstaining in terrorism, making and breaking policies, based on a conscious calculation of the next presidential primary or the next congressional vote, then our ability to survive in a dangerous world may be truly threatened.

Third, the writers clearly violated the Constitution by suggesting in closing that, "We re-affirm to you our continuing respect and friendship for the Nicaraguan people, and pledge our willingness to discuss these or other matters of concern with you or officials of your government at any time."

This promise to meet and talk with the Nicaraguan government is clearly unconstitutional. The Founding Fathers had a horrifying experience with the 13 individual states during the Articles of Confederation. They had learned the hard way that legislators made foreign policy implementation impossible if they were each free to go off on frolics of their own. Any study of the writings of the Founding Fathers will reveal their deep bias against Congress and in favor of the executive branch in foreign policy implementation.

CITIZEN DIPLOMATS ILLEGAL

Alexander Hamilton, in the Federalist No. 22, referring to the destructive impact of legislative involvement in foreign affairs, wrote:

"The faith, the reputation, the peace of the whole Union, are thus continually at the mercy of the prejudices, the passions, and the interests of every member of which it is composed. Is it possible that foreign nations can either respect or confide in such a government? Is it possible that the people of America will no longer consent to trust their honor, their happiness, their safety, on so precarious a foundation?"

Alexander Hamilton's principles became Thomas Jefferson's implementation. As first secretary of state in 1790, Jefferson warned the French revolutionary representative, Citizen Genet, that he could not deal directly with the Congress and interfere in American politics. Jefferson wrote that:

"The transaction of business with foreign nations is executive altogether. It belongs, then, to the head of that department, except as such portions of it are specially submitted to the Senate. Exceptions are to be construed strictly."

The constitutional historian John Bassett Moore described Jefferson's warning to the French representative:

"As the president was the only channel of communication between the United States and foreign nations, it was from him alone that foreign nations or their agents are to learn what is or has been the will of the nation," (Jefferson's words) that whatever he communicated as such, they had a right and were bound to consider 'as the expression of the nation' and that no foreign agent could be 'allowed to question it' or 'to interpose between him and any other branch of government under the pretext of either's transgressing their functions.'"

Our first great Supreme Court chief justice, John Marshall, as a representative in 1799 defended the executive prerogative:

"The president is the sole organ of the nation in its relations, and its sole representative with foreign nations."

Thus from Hamilton, Jefferson and Marshall it is clear that the Founding Fathers would have found the "Dear Comandante" letter a clear violation by legislators of the executive's exclusive right to deal with foreign governments.

Very probably the Founding Fathers would also have found this letter illegal. The very first time an American outside the executive branch tried to settle an American dispute with a foreign nation, the Founding Fathers passed a bill to make it illegal.

Our first experience with citizen diplomats came in 1798 when a Quaker named Logan visited Paris to negotiate better relations between the United States and France. The Congress promptly passed what is called the Logan Act. Just to focus its intent clearly, they called it "an act to prevent usurpation of executive functions." By the standards of that act (which is still in force), this letter is clearly illegal.

CONGRESSMEN VIOLATED LAW

The problem we face is that the signers of this "Dear Comandante" letter are not kooks or minor members of the House of Representatives. This letter was written on the stationery of the majority leader, Jim Wright of Texas. It was signed by the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Edward P. Boland of Massachusetts; three subcommittee chairmen of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mike Barnes of Maryland, Stephen Solarz of New York and Lee Hamilton of Indiana; two members of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, David Obey of Wisconsin and Matt McHugh of New York; and two other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Robert Torricelli and Robert Garcia; and Bill Alexander of Arkansas.

What should the House of Representatives do when 10 such knowledgeable and powerful men violate the Constitution and the law?

What should the American people do when congressional discipline breaks down so that an Armed Services Committee member submits his report to a foreign government while 10 leaders invite a foreign government to negotiate with them, to get involved in manipulating American politics, and inform that government that the 10 "have been and remain opposed to U.S. policy?"

There is no question of the right of every American inside the United States to argue over and oppose government policy.

There is no question of the absolute power of Congress to stop any American foreign effort by simply cutting off the money.

What is at issue in these two cases is not an issue of free speech and not an issue of congressional powers. What is at stake in these two cases is the actions of members of

the House who have undercut and weakened the legal policies of the United States as adopted by the House and Senate and signed by the president. These policies are not merely Reagan administration proposals. These policies are the legally adopted and legally implemented official policies of the American people as expressed by the government of the United States.

This is not a liberal or a conservative issue. This is not a Republican or Democratic issue. Whichever party is in the White House, whichever ideology is dominating American foreign policy, it is vital that this nation have the ability to implement a consistent, sustainable, coherent foreign policy. The only approach which will permit a successful American foreign policy is one which reestablishes the legitimate historic separation of constitutional powers and restores to the executive branch its exclusive prerogative to implement, while retaining for the legislative branch its power to appropriate, authorize and oversee.

We will have to confront these two violations of our system or we will face a future of chaos in which each legislator does whatever he or she thinks. How we confront it is a great challenge which the House, the executive branch and the public will have to explore. For the moment, let me simply say this is the most serious congressional-executive branch confrontation since Watergate. And this time it is Congress, not the White House, which has a major problem with law breaking and law enforcement.

□ 1450

Let me say this was printed originally in the Atlanta Journal Constitution on Sunday, April 22.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD at this point the full text of the letter to Comandante Ortega.

And I now briefly recognize the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and then I will yield a total of the same amount of time to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have seen the letter. I do not have it in front of me, but my recollection is this very important letter is two pages. Ten of the very important leaders of the Democratic side, including the majority leader, the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, subcommittee chairmen on Foreign Affairs, important ones, have written the Comandante Ortega and, first of all, they start out by saying:

We do not agree with our government's policy. We want you to know that in front. We do not support the aid to the Contras that our government is doing. That establishes our bona fides with you know, Comandante Ortega.

Then, as I recall, they continue to praise mildly sometimes, but nonetheless, praise Ortega and the Sandinistas for freeing up on free press, their diminishing censorship.

To the gentleman's knowledge is that true or is censorship just as total and as vicious as it has been since they took over?

Mr. GINGRICH. My understanding is that even recently La Prensa was

censored, up to 65 percent of its news columns, and refused to publish in protest.

Mr. HYDE. Well, now, they went on to praise the Sandinistas for their disposition to hold free elections. Now I read the paper like everybody else and I do not see that they are going to permit any of the Contras or the insurgents to participate in these free elections.

Is that the gentleman's definition of a free election?

Mr. GINGRICH. Well, it is ironic that no totalitarian Marxist regime has held a free election, while all of them have promised many.

Mr. HYDE. So their facts are wrong. And it is surprising to me because these are the leaders on the Democratic side. They have research available to them, well-paid staff who know these things. Their facts are wrong.

Now after telling Ortega they do not agree with our Government's policy, after stroking his fur about free elections and a free press, which are not existent in Nicaragua, do they in any place in that letter criticize Ortega for exporting revolution, guns, half the guns and 80 percent of the ammunition that is shooting and killing people in El Salvador? Do they ask for reciprocity? Do they condemn or criticize or admonish—let us use admonish as a nice soft word—Dear Comandante Ortega for exporting revolution? Do they do that in the letter?

Mr. GINGRICH. Not to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. HYDE. I did not see it either. Maybe the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ) will refresh our recollection. I will wait and listen carefully.

Mr. GINGRICH. We have used, I think, about 25 minutes. I would be delighted to yield 25 minutes to my very distinguished friend, very well informed, normally, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ). I listen with great interest.

Mr. SOLARZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Just on a housekeeping detail, how much time does the gentleman have for the special order?

Mr. GINGRICH. We have 30 minutes left. And the gentleman from Pennsylvania comes next and will be glad to yield the gentleman any additional time that the gentleman might want.

Mr. SOLARZ. I do not think it will be necessary for me to use all of the time, although I do appreciate the very gracious willingness of the gentleman from Georgia to make it available.

□ 1500

Let me say that, in my judgment, not since the day 37 years ago, when Senator Joseph McCarthy delivered

his speech in Wheeling, W. Va., in which he waved the sheet of paper on which he said he had the names of—what was it, 70 or 220? The gentleman from Illinois recalls?

Mr. HYDE. Yes. Fifty-seven.

Mr. SOLARZ. Fifty-seven Communists who were in the Department of State, has more been made out of less than the speech we have just heard from my very good friend from Georgia in the well of the House a few minutes ago.

If I may say so, what the gentleman has done is to transform the most tiny molehill into a tremendous mountain.

Let me try to put this whole business into perspective. The gentleman raises very profound questions about the constitutional relationship between the President and the Congress, and about the proper role of the House of Representatives in the foreign policy of our country. His analysis is entirely based upon his reading of this two page letter that was sent by 10 Members of the House to Mr. Daniel Ortega, the presumptive leader of the government in Nicaragua.

What was this letter all about? What did it say? Why was it sent? What did we hope to accomplish by sending it?

The gentleman may be interested to know that the idea for this letter did not originate with any 1 of the 10 Members who signed it. The idea for the letter originated with none other than Alfonso Robelo. He is probably known to the gentleman, and certainly is known to many Members of the House, as a genuine democrat, with a small "d." He is a Nicaraguan freedom fighter, someone who was very much a part of the effort to overthrow Mr. Somoza. He was one of the original members of the junta in Nicaragua, but he left that country and decided voluntarily to go into exile because he believed, as many of us do, that the Sandinistas have betrayed the democratic promises of their revolution.

Mr. Robelo is associated with Eden Pastora who, during the Nicaraguan revolution, was known by the name Commandante Zero. Both are leaders of the Nicaraguan organization ARDE.

When he approached us he was speaking not just for himself but for Mr. Pastora, and for those Nicaraguans who have joined them in the effort to establish a genuine democracy in that country.

Mr. Robelo asked us if we would be willing to send a letter to Mr. Ortega, in which we would attempt to persuade Mr. Ortega to agree to hold genuinely free and fair elections, when the elections are supposed to be held in Nicaragua later this year, and permit those Nicaraguan exiles who have taken up arms against the Sandinista government to return to their country to be given an opportunity to participate in the electoral process.

The 10 of us who agreed to sign the letter are all people, like the gentleman from Georgia, who want very much to see the establishment of a genuine democracy in Nicaragua.

I was under the impression that this was one of the fundamental objectives of the Reagan administration. The President has said time after time that a primary purpose of our policy toward Nicaragua is to persuade the Sandinistas to live up to the democratic promise they made during the course of their revolution, and to have genuinely free and fair elections in which all Nicaraguans would be permitted to participate.

In the process of sending this letter, therefore, it did not occur to us for a moment that we were attempting to undercut the established policy of our Government. We actually thought we were acting in a way completely compatible with the policy of our Government by urging the Sandinistas to do precisely what President Reagan says he has been trying to get them to do, albeit with different means, over the course of the last few years.

Now, what was it about this letter that was so objectionable; a letter which, in essence, asked the Sandinistas to have free and fair elections and to permit the exiles to participate in those elections?

I would not have thought such a letter was such a bad idea. We do, after all, believe in free elections; we do, after all, believe in national reconciliation, not only in El Salvador but in Nicaragua. On the face of it, it is hard to conceive what could have been objectionable about such a communication.

One objection we hear is that we had the nerve, the impropriety, the indecency to address this letter to Mr. Ortega by the title of "Dear Comandante."

That happens to be the man's title. If he were the president, it would have been "Dear Mr. President." If he were a member of the church, it would have been addressed to him by his title as a cleric. When Members of Congress send letters to foreign leaders, regardless of whether we approve of them or disapprove of them, it is established custom, it is established procedure, it is established protocol, to address those people by their titles. His title, for better or for worse, is "Comandante," so it was a "Dear Comandante" letter.

We are also told that this letter is somehow objectionable because it was sent to a foreign Communist dictator. I would not, for a moment, want to suggest that Mr. Ortega is anything but a foreign Communist dictator. He obviously is a foreigner. He would appear, on the basis of his own pronouncements, to be a Communist. And, it certainly seems to be the case that he is a dictator. I would suggest

that there is nothing unusual, let alone improper, for Members of the Congress to send letters to foreign Communist dictators. It happens all the time. I suspect there is hardly a Member of this Congress who has not, from time to time, signed such a letter.

For example, I have sent dozens of letters myself to Mr. Brezhnev, to Mr. Andropov, and now to Mr. Chernenko, together with dozens and dozens of my colleagues in the House. We have on many occasions urged them to permit the Soviet Jews, who are trapped in their country, and who would like to leave, to be able to do so.

I have written letters to foreign dictators who are not Communists—such as Mr. Marcos in the Philippines and Mr. Pinochet in Chile—asking them to release political prisoners who have been thrown into jail and, on occasion, tortured, not because they have committed any crimes, but simply because they happened to disagree with that particular government.

I do not know which of these letters my friend from Georgia has signed, but I have no doubt that he has affixed his signature to some of them. There is nothing unusual about sending letters to the leaders of foreign governments. We meet with them, and we write to them, all the time. It is part of our responsibility; it is part of our job.

Let me say, parenthetically, to my friend from Georgia, that when someone comes to me who is committed to democracy; when someone comes to me who is committed to freedom; when someone comes to me who believes in the independence of his country, and asks me to send a letter to the government of that nation, because he believes that it might be helpful in persuading that government to be more democratic; to permit a greater measure of freedom; to be independent, it seems to me that the least that I can do, and the least that our colleagues can do, if the letter is substantively compatible with our position, is to send such a letter.

I do not want my friend from Georgia to be under any illusions here. I was not very optimistic that this letter was going to persuade Daniel Ortega to agree to have free elections where he may not have intended to have free elections. I probably would not have thought to send this letter on my own if Mr. Robelo had not come to us and asked us to do it.

And why did he come to us here in the House?

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for interrupting, the gentleman is doing very well, but I could not resist this, to ask you: Does the gentleman happen to know, offhand, what Mr. Robelo's position is on aid to the Contras?

Mr. SOLARZ. Yes; Mr. Robelo would like us to continue providing aid to the Contras.

Mr. GINGRICH. So the gentleman is willing to sign a letter for him but not give him aid beyond the letter?

Mr. SOLARZ. Yes; I will be happy to get into that.

It is entirely appropriate, if not obligatory, for this country, as a defender of freedom and as an exponent of democracy, to use its influence with foreign governments that may not share our values to try to persuade them, through dialog and discussion, to have free elections and to be more democratic. In the case of Nicaragua, I have not believed it was appropriate for us to participate in an effort, through the use of force, to overthrow an established government.

□ 1510

We can open up the whole argument about the propriety of the covert operations against the Sandinistas. I am perfectly prepared to do that. We have discussed that on other occasions in the past, and we will have other occasions in the future.

I had thought, however, we were going to discuss today the question of the impropriety of this letter.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there is an old saying: "He who defines the argument has it half-won."

Now the gentleman keeps portraying this letter as simply in the mainstream of trying to persuade Comandante Ortega to go ahead and have elections. If that is what it did, I would have loved to have signed it.

But what the gentleman did at the behest of a Contra, is have you important people tell the Communists we do not support our government's policy of aiding the Contras. I do not follow the wisdom of this.

Mr. SOLARZ. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I was about to get to that point because I listened carefully to his presentation and I mentally filed away all of the various points that he made. I have been trying to work my way through them. I am almost at the point where I will get to those arguments and allegations.

The point I am making is that Mr. Robelo approached the 10 people who signed the letter for a very particular reason. He felt that, because we had voted against the funding for the Contras and precisely because we were known as opponents of this covert operation against Nicaragua, there was a possibility that we might have a measure of credibility with the leadership of Nicaragua, that those Members of Congress who had supported the covert operations would not.

As a matter of fact, my impression is that he was planning to ask some Members of the other body, who had

supported the covert operations, to send a letter as well. Then, the Sandinista leadership would get letters signed by those who were for the covert operations, and letters signed by those who were against it.

In any case, here in the House, Mr. Robelo came to us. He thought we would have a measure of credibility, and he asked us to send the letter.

Our critics also say that, by virtue of sending this letter, undercut the policy of our own Government, because we pointed out in the letter that we were opposed to the covert military operations against Nicaragua, in which our Government is apparently engaging, and that we intended to oppose it in the future.

Let us examine that allegation just for a moment. I would submit that we did not tell Mr. Ortega anything he did not know. Nicaragua has an Embassy here in Washington; they read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They knew that the 10 signatories of this letter, as indeed a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives, had voted against the covert operations in the past. We were not telling him anything he did not know. By virtue of pointing that out, we were indicating that there were Members of Congress, opposed to this covert operation, who nevertheless believed that it was important to have democratic elections in Nicaragua, and for the exiles to be permitted to return.

I must say to my very good friend from Georgia, that I was impressed with his historical review of various congressional interventions into our foreign policy that he presented to the House. He obviously is a learned scholar who knows American history very well. May I suggest to my friend from Georgia, that he has perhaps unwittingly suggested to us today that we ought to adopt, as the guiding organizational and political principle by which the Government of the United States operates, an American version of the Soviet principle of democratic centralism. What the gentleman seems to be suggesting is that, just as in the Soviet Union, once a policy is established, everybody has an obligation to support the policy no matter how misguided it may be.

Such an approach may make sense in the Soviet Union; their system has operated on that basis since the Bolshevik Revolution. I do not believe in it; I am sure the gentleman from Georgia does not believe in it. I am equally confident that my very good friend from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) does not believe in it and yet, this is what I seem to be hearing from the gentleman from Georgia.

I know he will say that he did not mean to suggest that Members of Congress should forsake their right to oppose policy. What he is really suggesting is that we should not express

our opposition to policy when we talk to foreign leaders.

All I can say to my friend from Georgia is that is rather unrealistic. Members of Congress do it all the time. I suspect members of the administration do it when they disagree with the policies of their own administration. As a matter of fact, if you listen to the statements that are made by the Secretary of Defense, by the Secretary of State, and by the head of the CIA, half the time they do not even agree among themselves—not to mention what some of the people in the Praetorian Guard in the White House have to say from time to time.

Pick up Mr. Haig's memoirs which just came out: "Caveat." It is a warning. I think the gentleman's comments could be applied just as well to the people in the executive branch.

The gentleman from Georgia goes on to say that there is a fundamental violation in this letter. Incidentally this is the first time I have heard a speech on the floor of the House where I half expected that, by the time it was completed, some of the Members would be led out in handcuffs and chains for having violated the law or the Constitution.

The gravamen of the gentleman's argument is that we committed an illegal act; we violated the Constitution, because we attempted to engage in negotiations with a foreign government. I can only say to the gentleman that, in his eagerness to draw up a bill of particulars against those of us who signed the letter, he has read far more into the letter than exists. There was absolutely no effort whatsoever, there was absolutely no intention whatsoever, to enter into negotiations with Mr. Ortega.

We understand full well that negotiations with a foreign government are the responsibility of the executive branch, and not of the Congress. What we did suggest to Mr. Ortega is that we were prepared to have discussions with him. Many of us have held discussions with him in the past. Members of Congress are visiting foreign countries and meeting with foreign leaders all of the time: that is part of our responsibility. I am sure the gentleman from Georgia would not suggest that Members of Congress should never meet with foreign leaders, or that they should never write to foreign leaders.

There was nothing ill-intentioned about our concluding statement; we simply said we would be prepared, if he wanted, to discuss this further. It was not an offer to negotiate. It certainly did not bespeak an intention or a desire to negotiate.

□ 1520

Last, we hear, particularly from the gentleman from Illinois, that this

letter was presumptively improper because of the way in which it was written. We did not include in the letter a long indictment of all of the sins of the Sandinista government. There is nobody who has spoken more eloquently against the Sandinistas on the floor of this House than my very good friend from Illinois. He has pointed out, over and over, often with great justice, that the Sandinistas have betrayed the democratic promises of their revolution. It may surprise him, but I agree completely. There is no doubt about that.

They promised free elections, and so far they have not had them. They promised nonalignment, and so far they have been a satellite of a satellite. I do not like that any more than the gentleman from Illinois.

But I learned a lesson 10 years ago when I first got involved in the public life of our country as a Member of Congress. The lesson I learned was that we can catch more flies with honey than with vinegar. When we are sending a letter to someone in which we are trying to persuade them to follow a particular course of action, it is fairly clear that we have a better chance of persuading them to do what we want if we couch the letter in conciliatory language rather than in condemnatory language.

I have sent condemnatory letters before, as has the gentleman from Illinois. I do not believe it would have served any useful purpose, since this was supposed to be a private communication, to have presented a bill of particulars against the Sandinista government, when we were trying to persuade them to have free elections and to permit the exiles to return.

If I were sending a public letter which I knew the gentleman from Illinois was going to comment on, and I was more interested in protecting myself from such accusations than in trying to have an impact on the leadership of Nicaragua, perhaps such a letter would have been sent. This letter was not sent for partisan purposes. It was not sent for polemical purposes. It was sent for one reason, and for one reason only, and on this point I will conclude.

It was sent because a man we admire, we respect, whose values we share and a genuine fighter for freedom in Nicaragua, came to us and said it would be helpful if we sent the letter to Mr. Ortega asking him to have genuinely democratic elections and to permit the exiles to return. He saw the letter. He thought it was compatible with his concerns. He wanted us to send it. I did not have it in my heart to turn my back on this man whose values I respect, whose objectives I share, whose commitment to democracy is as deep and sincere as my own, and say to him, "I am sorry. I

am not prepared to send such a letter."

Sending this letter was the very least we could do. Frankly, I find it hard to believe that my friends from Georgia and Illinois, who I know care deeply about democracy in Nicaragua—even if their commitment to democracy in Nicaragua was not expressed so eloquently in the days when Somoza was in power—believe in their heart of hearts that it was wrong for us to have asked the Nicaraguan leadership to have precisely the kind of free elections for which they have themselves asked.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the interesting comments of the gentleman from New York. As to the words about Somoza, if the gentleman will check the record, he will find that the dear friends of Mr. Somoza were on his side of the aisle. A gentleman from New York and a gentleman from California leap to mind. And the gentleman speaking of McCarthyism has just practiced it with a flourish and emulates the gentleman from Iowa, who is very practiced in the very same technique.

The gentleman from Illinois has never spoken a kind word for the former dictator. The gentleman from Illinois voted for \$75 million to go to the Sandinistas so that they could democratize the government.

Mr. SOLARZ. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to set the record straight. I did not suggest, nor did I mean to suggest, that the gentleman spoke a kind word about Mr. Somoza. What I did suggest was that I do not recall—and if I am mistaken please correct me—that in the days when Somoza was in power in Nicaragua the gentleman from Illinois spoke as eloquently in favor of genuinely democratic elections in Nicaragua as he has recently, since the Sandinistas have come to power.

I was for free elections in the Somoza days, and I am for free elections now. But just as I would have opposed an effort to overthrow Somoza through covert operations, I oppose an effort to overthrow the Sandinistas through covert operations.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman may well be correct. I do not recall that Somoza was uppermost in my mind when I served on the Banking Committee for 7 years. The gentleman has

been on the Committee on Foreign Affairs all of his adult life, it seems to me, so I can understand the gentleman's sensitivity to that.

When I learned about Mr. Somoza, I can assure the gentleman I did not join his fan club, and I supported the Sandinistas, to my chagrin, when they initially came to power with our assistance, in the hopes they would live up to their promises to the OAS, which they have not done.

I agree with the gentleman that the customary way of addressing someone is "Dear." If I wrote the gentleman, it would be "Dear Congressman Solarz," or even the familiar term "Dear Steve." But I cannot imagine myself writing, during World War II, "Dear Admiral Tojo," or "Dear General Yamashita," or "Dear Fuhrer."

Mr. SOLARZ. If the gentleman will yield further, has the gentleman signed any of the innumerable "Dear Colleague" letters which are sent by Members of the House to Mr. Brezhnev or Mr. Andropov?

Mr. HYDE. Yes; I have.

Mr. SOLARZ. And does the gentleman recall how those letters were addressed, what the salutation was in those letters?

Mr. GINGRICH. "Dear Chairman," I believe.

Mr. HYDE. Probably I used the word "Dear."

Mr. SOLARZ. If the gentleman will yield further, my recollection is—I do not have one of them with me—when we sent letters to Mr. Brezhnev, it was "Dear Mr. President," because his title was President of the Soviet Union. When we sent a letter to a Prime Minister, it was usually, "Dear Mr. Prime Minister." If we send it to a monarch, we used whatever title is appropriate to address a monarch. I remember once I met with Archbishop Makarios on Cyprus. His title was "Your Beatitude." I had never addressed anybody before as "Your Beatitude," but when I spoke to him I kept saying: "Your Beatitude, I am pleased to meet you. What is your view on this, Your Beatitude?" It was a kind of awkward formulation, but I used it out of respect for him.

Mr. HYDE. The gentleman is a master of protocol.

Mr. GINGRICH. If I may reclaim my time for a moment to make this point, because the gentleman from New York has raised a legitimate point, I do not object to the gentleman following protocol; I agree with the gentleman. If one is going to write a tyrant, it should begin, "Dear Tyrant." One should follow English etiquette in the way one addressed letters.

If I may go on for a second, the reason I made a point, and the reason the Wall Street Journal made a point about "Dear Comandante," is simply as the gentleman said earlier, and I

have to say, I was frankly encouraged with the gentleman's rather articulate and sophisticated understanding of democratic centralism and I am certain that, as somebody who therefore understands Leninism, the gentleman is aware of the fact that a Marxist-Leninist regime finds it almost impossible to have free elections. I am encouraged that a leading spokesman of the gentleman's party on the Committee on Foreign Affairs would understand the concept of democratic centralism.

Let me go back to say that my only point was that it is clear that the signers of the letter knew it was going to a current dictator. That is all. I think it is appropriate if you are going to write a current dictator that you address him by his right title. I was not making a big deal out of it.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield first to the gentleman from Illinois and then to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I find it a worthy subject for an abnormal psychologist to figure out how one reconciles the gentleman's almost sublime support for Mr. Robelo. It really brought almost a tear to my eye to listen to the gentleman talk about the spiritual kinship that the gentleman has with Mr. Robelo, but it stops right at the point where you give him some material aid, where you really support him where it counts. You support him spiritually, rhetorically, but not materially. I find that, as I say, strange, curious.

□ 1530

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, may I respond to that?

Mr. HYDE. Well, the gentleman went into that. All right, but it is the gentleman's time.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to allow everyone to speak.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair wishes to state that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) has 2 minutes left.

Mr. GINGRICH. Then, Mr. Speaker, let me close for a minute, and then the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER), I believe, has some time.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a Wall Street Journal editorial entitled "Dear Commandante." That will be included at the very end, and columns by Mr. Vander Linden, Mr. Buchanan, and Mr. Sobran will also be included at the very end.

Let me just say this, because I think later on, when you reread your statements, you will find you were carried away by the passion and the power of your own oratory, and when you read it, I think you will understand where both the gentleman from Illinois and I are coming from.

When one reads all the worthy things you said about Mr. Robelo, one almost expects you, like Saul on the road, to suddenly say, "Ah, in fact I believe in him so much that I will lead the charge for covert aid." And I just have to say to the gentleman that when you go back to read the text, you are going to be surprised because I agreed with everything you said. I think a man like that is worthy of support.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would simply respond to my two friends by saying that there are a lot of people in this world, and in our country, whom I respect and whose ideals I share, but with whom I have tactical disagreements. In this particular instance I certainly can understand why Mr. Robelo wants the United States to provide military assistance to the Contras. I do not happen to believe, as an American, that it is in our best interest to provide it. That in no way, however, diminishes my respect for him and what he is trying to do.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my good friend, the gentleman from New York, for whom I have enormous respect, that I have never written a letter to Chairman Brezhnev or Ambassador Dobrynin or anybody from the Soviet Union in as laudatory or optimistic terms as the gentleman has written to Commandante Ortega.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would say on that point, and in particular to the gentleman from Georgia, that if he thinks the most appropriate way to address letters to heads of these Communist governments is by calling them "Dear Tyrant," which, of course, the gentleman is free to do—

Mr. GINGRICH. Only if I—

Mr. SOLARZ. That may have the virtue of rhetorical exactitude, but I rather doubt that any of the people who were seeking succor in those countries, or who were trying to get a political prisoner released, or who were trying to have somebody given permission to emigrate, would go to the gentleman from Georgia and ask him to send a letter.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I include at the end of my remarks the various editorials to which I referred, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 17, 1984]

"DEAR COMANDANTE"

The more we look at the congressional uproar over the mines in Nicaragua, the more respect we have for forthright opponents of the administration's conception of how to prevent the spread of communism in Central America, people like Rep. Edward Boland and Sen. Patrick Leahy. And the more trouble we have with the posturings of

men who know better, like Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan and House Majority Leader Jim Wright.

Rep. Wright, for example, was one of the senior counselors to the Kissinger Commission on Central America, and seems to be listed as signing the final report, which included the following wisdom: "Because the Marxist-Leninist insurgents appeal to often legitimate grievances, a popular school of thought holds that guerrilla leaders are the engine of reform. They characteristically reinforce this by inviting well-meaning democratic leaders to participate in a Popular Front, taking care, however, to retain in their own hands a monopoly of the instruments of force. . . . Unfortunately, history offers no basis for such optimism. No Marxist-Leninist 'popular front' insurgency has ever turned democratic after its victory."

"Dear Comandante," writes the same Jim Wright to Daniel Ortega, coordinator of the Sandinista junta, in a letter exposed on the House floor last week by Rep. Newt Gingrich and reprinted nearby. Along with Rep. Boland, Michael D. Barnes (another Kissinger Commission counselor) and others, he urges that the Sandinistas hold free elections. The comandante must find this amusing, since the Sandinistas have repeatedly disavowed any intention of holding to a "bourgeois" conception of elections or democracy. The comandante will no doubt be gratified to learn that his pretenses of freedom of the press and assembly are quite enough for the majority leader and others, and that any way they understand his shortcomings are caused only by the hostility of their own government. In all, he must deeply appreciate the assurances that in his quarrel with the U.S. government the Congressmen take his side.

Acres of trees are being consumed, meanwhile, to make the newsprint necessary for Sen. Moynihan's protestation that he knew nothing of the mines until the day after he voted money to fund the covert actions against Nicaragua. He has resigned as vice chairman of the Senate intelligence committee because he wasn't fully briefed. He never dreamed that it would actually come to scaring seafarers with acoustical mines; the CIA allowed him to assume he was only voting the money to send kids into the jungle to kill and die. If the good senator didn't know about the mines, and didn't understand that the U.S. was helping, he must have been the last non-institutionalized American of voting age to get the word.

About these postures, the forthright opponents are scathing. Rep. Boland told the House: "There has been some complaint about some other body not keeping pace with what was happening. That is their responsibility." And Sen. Leahy remarked: "One advantage of a covert operation is that it allows an awful lot of people who knew about it to say they didn't. It will be fascinating to see the number of senators who will object to the mining during the coming week when virtually the whole Senate had a chance to vote on the issue of covert operations against Nicaragua last week and most members knew the mining was part of it."

Make no mistake, we profoundly disagree with Rep. Boland and Sen. Leahy. We believe that the spread of Marxist-Leninist dictatorships through Central America will eventually be seen by nearly all Americans as a threat to their vital interests. We believe the policy of the U.S. should be to do whatever it can to prevent that spread at an early stage, before major military action is necessary. Conceivably, though barely so,

this could be done by a negotiated settlement ending all military shipments to the region. More likely, it will require finding a way to prevent the consolidation of the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua. The U.S. government has supplied the Nicaraguan contras to give the Sandinistas an incentive to negotiate and to provide an alternative if negotiations fail.

This is serious business, as the Boland-Leahy types recognize. It is not merely a matter of Jim Wright signing the Kissinger report to his Texas voters will reflect him as their congressman, and signing the "Dear Comandante" letter so the liberal Democrats will some day elect him as their speaker. Nor merely a matter of Sen. Moynihan's grand strategic recognition that he can remain senator from New York to long as the left is sufficiently pacified it doesn't mount a third-party challenge in a general election.

What we have learned in the mining episode, unhappily, is that the Wright-Moynihan hypocrisies neatly capture the sense of the Congress. The collective judgment of Congress agrees that something must be done about Nicaragua. Before the mining controversy, with the lopsided defeat of Sen. Kennedy's crippling amendments on Central American funding, a consensus seemed to be developing to put that judgment into practice. But the Congress of the U.S. was spooked by a few newspaper stories revealing that the CIA was doing what every serious person in the world already knew it was doing. Now it threatens to come back and cut off the funds for all purposes, replacing the Monroe Doctrine with the Brezhnev Doctrine—that once a Marxist-Leninist dictatorship is established it cannot be challenged. And in justifying this in private, the congressmen will blame the American voters, despite all the elections in which voters preferred American strength to American weakness.

The result will be spreading turmoil in Central America, perhaps eventually including war with American participation, and growing doubts in all the world's trouble spots about America's role as a superpower. The Wrights and Moynihans of Congress know this, which is why they are willing to spend millions of dollars. But they are not willing to spend a single ounce of courage.

CAPITOL HILL PEN PALS OF NICARAGUA'S BOSS (By Frank Vander Linden)

Ten Democratic Congressmen have sent a letter to Nicaragua's Marxist boss, Daniel Ortega, assuring him of their undying opposition to "U.S. support for military action" against his regime, even while he has agents abroad, collecting more aid from Libya, Iran and the Soviet Union.

Majority Leader Jim Wright of Texas refuses to apologize for being Ortega's pen pal, although Rep. Newt Gingrich, the outraged Georgia Republican who revealed the letter, charged that it showed "sympathy and support" for a foreign dictator against this country.

Gingrich centered his fire on the Democrats' statement: "We have been, and remain opposed to U.S. support for military action directed against the people or government of Nicaragua."

Every one of the signers of the letter knew that their government was underwriting "covert operations" against the leftist Sandinista regime in Nicaragua, because "they had been personally briefed on those operations," Gingrich said.

Among the signers was Edward Boland of Massachusetts, the Intelligence Committee chairman, who was secretly briefed back on Jan. 31 about the mine-laying in Nicaragua's harbors, which caused such a hurricane of protests and majority votes in both houses of Congress, condemning it.

Wright's excuse is that the Democrats were pleading with Ortega to allow a free press and "truly free and open elections," as promised. But the elections, which are supposed to take place in November, will be modeled after those of the Sandinistas' great benefactors, the Soviet Union and Cuba, with their own victory guaranteed in advance.

Ortega, only a few days ago, welcomed home his agents who have been abroad soliciting aid from their revolutionary brothers. Dr. Sergio Ramirez Mercado, a junta member, declared upon returning from Iran and Libya that both expressed firm solidarity with Nicaragua.

During six days in Iran, Dr. Ramirez said, he met with dictator Khomeini, had "several work sessions with the cabinet and revolutionary leaders," and visited one zone of the Iran-Iraq war. Then he dropped in on Col. Mu'ammarr Qadhafi in Libya and won his support for Nicaragua's resistance against "the aggressive escalation by the United States," as he called it.

Defense Minister Humberto Ortega, home from a 15-day mission to Moscow and North Korea, said "we achieved political and material solidarity" with those Communist powers. The defense minister met with the Soviet's top brass: Marshal Dmitry Ustinov; his first deputy, Marshal Nikolay Ogarkov; and Admiral Sergey Gorshkov. They "had a friendly talk on questions of mutual interest," the Soviet news agency TASS said.

When Daniel Ortega visited Mexico City a few days ago, the press there quoted him as saying: "Should the United States engage in an open military intervention in Nicaragua, the resistance struggle could extend even into U.S. territory."

"The objective of the Nicaraguan government" he said, "is the integration of Central America."

That remark confirms the Reagan administration's contention that it is justified in applying pressure against the Sandinistas because they're building up a big military force, with Soviet and Cuban arms, for eventually controlling all of Central America.

Rep. Jack Kemp, R-N.Y., has given his House colleagues a chilling picture of the real "Comandante Ortega," whom he met in Managua on a recent tour with the Kissinger Commission.

"I can remember listening to Comandante Ortega talk about his plans for controlling the future of Nicaragua and of Central America," the New York Republican said.

This was "eye-opening," Kemp said, even to the liberal Democrats present, including AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland and former Democratic National Chairman Robert Strauss.

"As we left Managua on the plane, I heard Henry Kissinger say to Lane Kirkland that he felt like he was leaving Nazi Germany in the late 1930s," Kemp said, "I, too, felt like I was leaving a fascist or a Nazi country."

(Frank van der Linden is The Union's White House correspondent.)

[From the Washington Times, Apr. 20, 1984]

MASH NOTE TO A THUG (By Pat Buchanan)

Two decades ago, Black Panther Eldridge Cleaver penned a searing account of his racial hatred of American society. That hatred extended, he wrote, to defiling white women in revenge for what had been done to black women over the centuries. *Soul on Ice* was a publishing sensation. The literary elite and the radical chic announced discovery of a writer of rare talent, an authentic black revolutionary who had something important to say to white America.

Following a subsequent shootout with Oakland police, Mr. Cleaver fled the country for Algiers, Havana, Pyongyang, Hanoi, and other revolutionary capitals. Gradually his eyes opened to the reality of the revolutionary communism he espoused. So, a chastened radical came home to face trial—declaring prison in the United States preferable to life under communist rule. In *Soul on Fire*, Mr. Cleaver wrote how his hatred of racist, fascist America had given away to appreciation, then affection, then patriotic fervor; how, in the cooled ashes of black rage had arisen a new faith, Christianity. As he reminded me the other night, *Soul on Fire* was not even reviewed in the publications that trumpeted *Soul on Ice*.

What recalls the Cleaver episode, and the mindset exposed, is the publication by Rep. Newt Gingrich, R-Ga., of a letter signed by 10 ranking House Democrats, including Majority Leader Jim Wright, to the Marxist thug who heads up the most rabid anti-American regime on the continent.

Addressed to Daniel Ortega, the letter opens with the salutation, "Dear Comandante." From there it proceeds to lend new richness to the term "bootlick."

"We address this letter to you in a spirit of hopefulness and good will."

"As members of the U.S. House of Representatives, we regret the fact that better relations do not exist between the United States and your country. We have been, and remain, opposed to U.S. support for military action directed against the people or government of Nicaragua."

By this supportive missive, Jim Wright, Michael Barnes, Steve Solarz, et al., have passed beyond opposing U.S. policy. They are undercutting and sabotaging policy, giving aid and comfort to the Castroite clique that rules Nicaragua. Were the conflict for Central America a declared, rather than an undeclared, war, Jim Wright and his fellow Sandinista sympathizers would be trifling with treason.

Unmentioned in this congressional mash note to the Marxist junta is that regime's appalling record on human rights, its persecution of the Catholic Church, its atrocities against the Miskito Indians, its massive military buildup, its thickening ties to Moscow, its export of revolution to El Salvador.

Wright & Co. see only social progress. "We want to commend you and the members of your government for taking steps to open up the political process in your country . . . We support your decision to schedule elections this year, to reduce press censorship, and to allow greater freedom of assembly for political parties. Finally, we recognize that you have taken these steps in the midst of ongoing military hostilities on the borders of Nicaragua."

Finally, this gracious offer: If you will continue on your "hopeful" path, "Those responsible for supporting violence against

your government, and for obstructing serious negotiations for broader political participation in El Salvador would have far greater difficulty winning support for their policies than they do today."

Let me translate this into the vernacular: look fellas, give us a little more running room and we will cut the legs out from under President Reagan and the "contras," and help bring into the government of El Salvador the Marxist guerrillas you support.

Finally: "We reaffirm to you our continuing respect . . . and pledge our willingness to discuss these or other matters of concern with you or officials of your government at any time."

The American people elected Ronald Reagan to conduct U.S. foreign policy, but the Democratic leadership is willing to do some extra-constitutional negotiating to win the Marxists in Managua and their allies in El Salvador a better deal.

No need to ask Dean Rusk's question: Whose side are you on? In the war between the Western democracy and Castroism for Central America, Jim Wright and the Democratic leadership are on the side of the Sandinistas.

[From the Washington Times, Apr. 24, 1984]

ORTEGA GOT THEIR "MATING" MESSAGE
(By Joseph Sobran)

Ten Democratic congressmen, including Majority Leader Jim Wright of Texas, have sent an extraordinary letter to the head of Nicaragua's Marxist-Leninist regime, Daniel Ortega. My colleague Patrick Buchanan describes the letter as a "mash note." I would term it a mating call.

"We want to commend you and the members of your government for taking steps to open up the political process in your country." What effrontery of false naivete. Communist promises (the letter never uses the word "communist") are taken at face value, while the 67-year communist record of breaking promises is unmentioned. The Sandinistas have kept that record intact, which is why the former hero of the Nicaraguan revolution, Eden Pastora, has joined the "contras."

Mr. Pastora was once a darling of the American media. Now they ignore him, portraying the "CIA-backed rebels" as a residue of disgruntled Somocistas—exactly the Sandinista line. It hardly matters to liberals, in the media and in Congress, that the Sandinistas have increased repression, not relaxed it, building up the standard communist infrastructure of total control. The Wright letter—which begins respectfully, "Dear Comandante"—says nothing about this, nor, as Mr. Buchanan notes, about the persecution of the Catholic Church and the Miskito Indians, nor about the regime's Soviet-aided military buildup and export of revolution.

The thrust of the letter is a plea, couched in liberal euphemism, for enough democracy to undercut Ronald Reagan—"those responsible for supporting violence against your government, and for obstructing serious negotiations for broad political participation in El Salvador"—and to help his domestic enemies, or "strengthen the hands of those in our country who desire better relations based upon true equality, self-determination and mutual good will."

It is strictly a plea. There is no hint that the failure to hold "truly free and open elections" would cost the Sandinistas the "continuing respect and friendship" of these 10 abject Democrats.

We face the old question: Why are liberals always so determined to see incipiently liberal enterprises in communist regimes which annihilate those procedural freedoms that liberalism is nominally devoted to?

Consider the unhappy fortunes of the word "liberal." A true liberal, such as the late Raymond Aron, or the venerable Friedrich Hayek, really does put free procedures, the rule of law and limited government ahead of any concrete outcome they may lead to. In Europe, the word "liberal" still retains this sense, which moves English observers such as Graham Hough and Maurice Cranston to remark that Americans who call themselves "liberals" would in Europe be called "socialists," since their real priority is not procedure for its own sake, but the outcome they call "social justice."

Mr. Hayek doubts that any such ideal outcome is even possible, and scorns it as the "mirage of social justice." He makes a basic distinction between the "rule-governed" order of liberalism and the diverse "end-governed" orders of socialists, theocrats, fascists, and others. Mr. Aron, Michael Oakeshott and Bertrand de Jouvenel make the same distinction. You can argue a case for end-governed regimes, but you can't have it both ways: Either you subordinate the rule of law to your ends, or you accept the rule of law and let the chips fall where they may.

Brummagem American liberals want to have it both ways. They pursue a socialist agenda in essence while using the rhetoric of "process," "rights" and "democracy." They use these terms selectively, gerrymandering legal procedures to get the result they want. That is why they are so patient with regimes that skip the procedures to impose raw socialism.

At the moment it is tactically desirable, the 10 Democrats are saying, for the Sandinistas to do what the Democrats do: adopt the disguise of democratic forms. While they are at it, they might ask the Sandinistas to rephrase the new national anthem, which calls the "Yanqui" the "enemy of humanity."

CONGRESSIONAL UNDERMINING OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN CENTRAL AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair for the recognition.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I would just suggest to my dear friend, the gentleman from New York, that there is a difference between fawning and there is a difference between being obsequious and polite realism, and I suggest that if there is any sin in the letter, it is on the side of obsequiousness and fawning rather than polite realism.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, let me say that I consider this to be a sign of

the progress that we have made in this debate. When it started out, we were presumptively guilty of illegal and unconstitutional action; now the most we are guilty of is obsequiousness. I hope that if the gentleman has a chance to reread the letter, he will see that it has not gone beyond the line of politeness to obsequiousness.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I will ask this one time, and I will not ask him to yield any more.

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I have problems with saying that it is unconstitutional or illegal. I am not sure that is so, I am not sure it is not so, but I would not make that point that the gentleman from Georgia did—and he is a scholar—but I would say it is abysmal judgment. That is my impeachment of it, abysmal judgment, running your own State Department, with you, Mr. Robelo, and your nine cosignatories saying to Ortega, "We don't support our Government's policy. That is a sign of our strength and virtue. We don't support Robelo in his Contra effort even though we are his spiritual blood brothers, and you are doing great. And keep it up on free elections and free press, and God bless you, Commandante."

That is my complaint. It could have been done differently in the same purpose, but not done quite as unrealistically and euphemistically.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that the thing that struck me most when I first read the letter on the floor a few days ago was the fact that it was a bootlicking letter, it was the kind of a letter that you send and you lick the boots of the dictator to whom you are sending it. It really is disturbing, I think, from that standpoint.

I think that some of the defense that we have heard of the letter here today is something less than a defense that I would like to see made on this House floor. It is the kind of defense that we have heard too much of here lately, that as soon as someone raises the point that there is too much in the way of fawning over Communist dictatorships in the world, somehow the charge of McCarthyism gets raised on this floor. I am getting awfully tired of hearing Members come to this floor and suggest that those of us who are discussing legitimate issues are in fact engaging in McCarthyistic tactics. In this case the gentleman from Georgia has said specifically what his charges are, and he has outlined those specifically with materials that seem to make his point very, very well. That is hardly in the realm of McCarthyism.

In fact, McCarthyism is very much, as the gentleman from Illinois said a few minutes ago, coming from the other side in some of the statements that have been made in regard to the Somocista characterizations made on this floor by the gentleman from Iowa in debate the other day and to a lesser extent by the gentleman from New York today.

I think those kinds of things are disturbing, and when they become a defense for the kind of letter that is the subject of this discussion, I think it is disturbing and does not do the case much good.

I think that the discussion here today has raised a number of questions. Based upon the discussion we heard from the gentleman from New York, it will be interesting to note who actually wrote this letter. We hear that it was written at the behest of Mr. Robelo. If in fact it was written at his behest, did he see the letter before it was sent? Was he aware the letter was being sent, and that in it there was a condemnation of aid to the Contras? If this was being done at his behest, one wonders whether or not he was aware of what was being done on his behalf.

The other question that comes up is, I wonder if the letter has been answered. I wonder if Mr. Ortega has bothered to answer the gentleman from Texas, the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Massachusetts, and some of these other Members, and I wonder what that answer said. It would be very interesting for us to know just what the response of the Nicaraguan Government has been since supposedly we were doing this in order to enhance policy rather than detract from policy.

It would be most interesting to this gentleman to know how Mr. Ortega responded to the kind of fawning that went on in that particular letter. It would also be interesting to know what kind of signal that sent, and it would be interesting for us to know—and there is no way that we will know it—what the Cubans' reaction to that kind of letter was coming from the leaders of this House. How did the Soviets react to that kind of letter coming from the leaders of this House?

It seems to me that they have to understand that there is a feeling among the leadership of this House that they do not have the willingness to really oppose a Nicaraguan aggression throughout Central America. And let us understand that Nicaraguan aggression in Central America is very much a matter of fact. The Nicaraguans are not a benign group of freedom fighters within their own Government or within their own country who are satisfied for their Government to be a mere facilitator for the people of that country toward a better life. They

have said specifically and in fact Comandante Ortega to whom we have been referring to here has said very specifically that their revolution extends to all of Central America, and most recently he was quoted by a columnist as saying that he could see a time possible when the revolution could be extended into U.S. territory. I think that that makes it quite clear that we are dealing with an aggressive force here, not a benign force.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am very glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make some points that I think may have gotten lost in the earlier dialog with the gentleman from New York.

First of all, I am raising some very serious questions about this letter because it fits into a pattern. It does not stand as an isolated document. There has been a growing tendency in the Congress, and there have been two recent quotes, one from Jesse Jackson, who is one of the Democratic candidates for President and who said, "We must support the Government of Nicaragua." That is a strange situation given the current situation within the U.S. Congress.

□ 1540

Another from a Member of this Congress, who said between April 11 and 15:

The President blames the Congress for interfering with his military exploits. I say, thank God we do.

There is a growing tendency, particularly in the American left, to say that there is a moral supremacy to interfering with the execution of American foreign policy.

The quote I used earlier, which was in the Atlanta newspapers, of a decent, well-meaning, sincere American, who thought that the morally correct thing to do if his government was mining the harbors in Nicaragua was to have a public charity drive to buy a minesweeper for the government that we were mining the harbors against.

Now, we face, I think, a real crisis in our capacity to live in a dangerous world. We are talking here today in the aftermath of the horror in London where the Libyan terrorist government had one of their diplomats shoot and kill a policewoman, wound 11 other people, and then arrogantly threaten to hold hostage 8,000 Britons, if the British Government did anything to get the murderer.

We are standing here today in the aftermath of a bombing of the U.S. Officers Club in this city last weekend.

Mr. WALKER. Supposedly in concert with the Sandinistas in Central America.

Mr. GINGRICH. Precisely. We are standing here at a time when the Nicaraguan dictator, the man that they wrote the letter to, Ortega, was quoted recently in Mexico City in a visit there saying that if the United States interferes directly with Nicaragua, they should expect us to carry the war to America.

We are standing in a building which now has around it large concrete pillars to stop trucks with dynamite or explosives from running into the Capitol and we enter this building through areas where we are searched to prevent terrorists from walking into this Capitol and we are told that it is reasonable for serious Members of this Congress to write overseas.

Now, I am not a lawyer. I have been told by the gentleman from New York and others that the word "illegal" is too strong. Maybe it is too strong. The Logan Act seems to me fairly clear. The Logan Act seems to me to cover what happened. Maybe that is too strong a word. Clearly, not everyone understands. No one is going to engage in any kind of legal action. It is not conceivable and no one would want that to happen; but where do you draw the line and what does the line mean? Should there be a House rule? Should we in fact have a rule that says that Members of Congress should not write or engage in private dealings with foreign governments that they know the U.S. Government is in difficulty with?

We can say difficulties would be Congress passing various appropriations for covert actions. That would be a sign of some difficulty.

I would say when the gentleman from New York earlier was talking about the letters all of us have signed to the Soviet dictatorship, it is important to recognize that none of those letters were in opposition to U.S. policy.

Mr. WALKER. I think that is a very important point that needs to be emphasized. Most of us have signed those letters, but what we were attempting to do was to enhance U.S. policy, which is aimed at implementing the Helsinki Pact that called for the release of all those people.

Mr. GINGRICH. Precisely.

Mr. WALKER. So we were attempting to enhance the policies of this government, not be critical of those policies, so as to mislead a foreign government. There is a totally different kind of letter involved here in this case, the letter that we are talking about. That letter is a letter in which these Members of Congress took it upon themselves to say that our Government and we are different parties in this whole matter. Our Government is pursuing one policy, our policy is something separate. That is a totally different kind of letter.

I would be glad to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. GINGRICH. That is exactly right.

The question also becomes, I am not sure what our job is as Members right now. If we have a case, which I think has to raise great doubts, in which a staff member of this Congress was sent to a Marxist dictatorship in Grenada with a copy of a proposed report to be issued by a Member of this Congress and the minutes of the Grenadian dictatorship were very clear that they thought at least that they could change the report in any way they wanted to.

What then are the obligations of the U.S. Congress?

I think all these questions are serious. I think if the Speaker has to look ultimately, are the rules of Congress adequate? Is this behavior that we want to continue? Are there precedents for it? Do we have any examples in congressional history of Members of the Congress writing a foreign government during a period when that government was engaged in direct difficulties with the United States? I do not know.

As I say, writing to that government saying in effect that they were against the policies of the U.S. Government, which is what that letter clearly says at that point; so I just wanted to suggest that there are some very serious, some very difficult and unanswered questions, that this is not a mountain made out of a molehill, rather this is a mountain which has been invisible.

This is the reason that 2½ weeks ago the President said that he thought it was almost impossible to manage American foreign policy because the Congress was undercutting it. This is the kind of difficulty which we saw with the Soviets involved in the West German elections last year.

We have recent reports that the Soviets may be involved in our elections this fall, trying to influence them.

I think for us to decide that factions of Americans can deal directly with foreign governments in opposition to the faction of America that happens to be the American Government, is a very, very dangerous precedent.

To the best of my knowledge, and I would say this to all 10 of the gentlemen who signed the letter, if they can find ample precedent, if it is the norm to write foreign governments we are in difficulties with telling them you oppose U.S. policies, then frankly I guess I would have to say maybe we ought to change the norm, that what they did is normal. I think the country would want to change that norm; but to the best of my knowledge, I cannot find, and I have asked a number of experts, I cannot find any evidence that there is any kind of precedent for this kind of letter.

The defense of the gentleman from New York that, after all, we would have to write this letter, I think is a little thin from this standpoint. Had they written a letter saying that we reject your policies in El Salvador, we reject the kind of dictatorship and censorship you have, but we would like to have better relations and if you would hold good relations, hold honest elections and let the exiles come home, maybe we could have good relations, I do not think I would be here today and I do not think the gentleman from Pennsylvania would be here today.

In that case, they might have written a letter that might or might not be wise in the long run in the structure of the Constitution; but it clearly would not in any sense cross the bounds.

But there are at least three or four places in that letter where in my judgment as a former teacher of history they clearly have crossed the boundary and they have clearly written a letter that at a minimum is so unwise, that is a precedent for future behavior, that if we allow that letter to stand, if we as a House decide that is appropriate behavior for House Members, we are establishing a precedent that I think will come back to haunt this country. I think that is the grounds I want to lay this case on, that at a minimum it is so unwise that we should repudiate the letter and we should adopt some kind of rule or resolution making clear to future House Members that you do not send your staffs to Marxist dictators asking their advice in terms of a report that you are going to issue and you do not write letters to foreign governments with whom we are in difficulty, suggesting to them that you are against U.S. policy.

Now, if we as a House cannot adopt a policy that repudiates that kind of behavior and that kind of language, then I think we are setting a precedent which is going to come back to haunt this country.

I appreciate very much the gentleman from Pennsylvania yielding.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I think it is very important to understand that the gentleman is making a very important point when he talks about the pattern that is involved here with regard to the kind of congressional action involving U.S. foreign policy. We really are talking about something which is disturbing in terms of the pattern being developed. We have a situation here where Congress is, in fact, interfering on a regular basis in the conduct of foreign policy and then not willing to take responsibility for the actions that it takes.

Just the other day when we passed the measure on the mining of the harbors in Nicaragua, it was not an act where we took any responsibility for

our action. We basically passed a press release out here. This was not any action where we are saying we now take responsibility for whatever happens as the result of cutting off funds. This was simply an action that was taken that undercuts the policy, but assigns no responsibility to ourselves, a thoroughly gutless kind of resolution.

It seems to me that this letter falls into the same category. It was revealed in the course of the discussions here that this was a letter never meant to be made public. In other words, it was never meant to have the context of holding the people who wrote it responsible for having written it. It was never supposed to have this kind of public airing. We were told that here today—no responsibility.

Members of this House have said recently that they do not want to be held responsible for what took place in Lebanon, that that was purely the President's action, forgetting, of course, that it was we who forced the President into passing or endorsing a resolution calling for an 18-month stay for our troops. And what did that do? It sent all the wrong signals into Lebanon. It sent signals to our friends in Lebanon that they had 18 months in which to make accommodations and immediately some of the negotiations toward unifying Lebanon slowed down as soon as that resolution was passed, because a timeframe was set.

It also sent a message to the terrorists in Lebanon that if you drove us out in less than 18 months, you lose, meaning the United States loses and we win.

It sent that kind of message and it is not surprising in that context then that those same terrorists would attack the marine barracks and kill 245 young marines.

So that we indeed are responsible, because we endorsed policies which have to hold us responsible for what takes place in the world and to back off then and say: "Oh, no, don't blame us when things go wrong," or to pass resolutions that have no meaning so that we cannot be blamed in the future I think is the kind of performance that is illfitting for a nation that wants to have its freedom survive.

So the gentleman from Georgia when he makes the point of the context in which this letter was written makes a very important point, because the letter was written by people who have shown day after day on this House floor that they are willing to undercut the foreign policy of this Government, but are unwilling then to assume the consequences of the actions that were taken.

□ 1550

I am pleased that I have the opportunity in this special order to help

with a summation of this particular matter.

This letter is one of the more disturbing things that has happened in modern times in this Congress and I would hope, as the gentleman from Georgia has suggested, that this House will take appropriate actions to see to it that we do not have further incidents of this kind in the future.

I yield back the balance of my time.

THE METRIC SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RUDD) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, later this week, the House is scheduled to take up H.R. 5172, the National Bureau of Standards authorization. This measure is nearly \$8 million over the administration's fiscal year 1985 budget request, and \$18 million over fiscal year 1984 levels. While this may seem like a relatively small amount compared to overall Federal spending, it represents a significant portion of the NBS budget—a 13-percent increase over last year's levels; \$500,000 of that amount can be cut painlessly by eliminating the costly, duplicative study of metric use and conversion authorized under title II. Eliminating the \$500,000 study will obviously not balance the budget, but it is the accumulation of numerous unnecessary expenditures such as this that has helped to drive the deficit to an estimated \$174.5 billion for fiscal year 1985 alone.

In 1978, the General Accounting Office [GAO] concluded the most complete and objective analysis ever undertaken of metric use and conversion in this country, and found that the benefits of conversion would be negligible, but that the costs would be substantial—in the billions of dollars.

Besides the GAO report, numerous other reports on metric have been issued by the Federal Government. For example, an earlier study by the Commerce Department with regard to metric and international trade found that "the notion that the United States is losing exports to metric countries because its products are not designed and manufactured in metric units and standards appears to be ill-founded."

Problems of conversion have also been noted in the media. For example, a 1980 report in the American Metric Journal entitled, "U.S. Metric Board: A Total Failure," discussed the negative public reactions toward metric conversion at eight out of nine U.S. Metric Board public forums held in different cities across the Nation.

Whether for or against conversion to metric, there is ample data available upon which to consider a national policy with respect to metric. We do

not need to waste another \$500,000 of the taxpayers' money on a duplicative study.

The fact is, however, that this is more than just an effort to study the metric system. Some metric proponents have called it a means of paving the way for the removal of what they claim is a longstanding major obstacle to the improvement of U.S. trade opportunities, apparently referring to our customary system of measurements as the obstacle. Obviously, they have ignored the fact that American firms have been using our customary system of weights and measures and trading for centuries with countries that use different measurement systems, speak different languages, and have different laws and requirements that must be complied with for we have nevertheless become the most successful and technically advanced manufacturing nation in the world.

In its 1978 report, the GAO found that 80 percent of the largest U.S. industrial businesses—the Fortune 500—did not expect any significant change in exports or imports as a result of metric conversion, this confirmed the findings of the earlier Commerce Department report.

This finding was also confirmed in a recent report by the American National Metric Council which found that only 16 percent of the Fortune 1,000 industrial firms felt they experienced a loss in sales because their products were not in metric measurements. Apparently, 84 percent did not feel there was any detrimental effect on exports or imports as a result of the use of customary weights and measures, nor were unsure of any substantial effect on trade.

One more point from the GAO report should be highlighted with respect to international trade. The GAO found that a mere 5 percent of Fortune 500 firms responding to their survey believed measurement units to be of any major significance at all in deterring trade.

Beside all of the metric studies, the U.S. Metric Board spent more than \$8.7 million during its 5-year existence between fiscal year 1978 and fiscal year 1982, much of it on public meetings, and educational and advertising programs. While the termination of funding for the Metric Board by the 97th Congress would have appeared to settle the question of Federal involvement, metric programs have nevertheless been continued through the Office of Metric Programs at the Department of Commerce. That Office had a budget of \$300,000 in fiscal year 1983 and \$320,000 in fiscal year 1984.

If so much has been spent on metric programs without success and so much time has elapsed, it must clearly indicate that conversion to the metric system is neither wanted nor needed, so why is there a need for yet another

study? The answer is simple. Another study is a way of keeping the issue alive despite the fact that the American people clearly do not want to convert to the metric system.

The fact is that the American people, without question, oppose conversion to the metric system. A 1977 Gallup poll, the last poll taken on the issue according to the Congressional Research Service, revealed that only 24 percent of the American people favored conversion.

When the Federal Highway Administration proposed conversion of highway speed signs to metric in 1977, public comment was extensive—98 percent opposed the scheme. When the meat and poultry division of the Department of Agriculture proposed meat and poultry sales in metric, 75 percent were opposed.

Furthermore, let me emphasize that Congress, which has the sole authority under article I, section 8 of the Constitution to fix the standard of weights and measurements, has never authorized nor endorsed forced conversion to metric.

Much of the confusion with respect to Federal policy on metric has arisen from the passage of the Metric Conversion Act of 1975. That act provided only for a continuation of the existing voluntary policy for use of either metric or our customary system of weights and measures—a policy established as far back as 1866. The 1975 act set no timetable for conversion.

Let me make it clear that I do not oppose the metric system. Those who wish to convert to metric or stand to gain from it, can legally convert and should do so. However, I strongly oppose Government's unwarranted promotion and costly mandatory imposition of metric on the American people who do not wish to convert and who stand little or no benefit from conversion.

We have already had numerous studies of metric, and to date Congress has not chosen to endorse metric conversion. We should not authorize another waste of the taxpayer's money on yet another so-called one-time study and continue the confusion about Federal policy with respect to metric.

When the National Bureau of Standards authorization comes before the House later this week, I will offer an amendment to strike the metric study from the bill. I urge my colleagues to support that amendment.

□ 1600

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LEWIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to official business, I was not on the House floor for the vote on final passage of S. 373, Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1983. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."●

LEGISLATION TO AMEND SMALL BUSINESS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BROOKS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, the House will be considering H.R. 2133, a bill to amend the Small Business Act.

As many of my colleagues already know, I have strong reservations about this legislation. The proponents of H.R. 2133 have indicated that the primary purpose of the bill is to correct the waste and abuse in Federal procurements, particularly in the spare parts area. Ostensibly, H.R. 2133 will accomplish this purpose by increasing "small business involvement" in the Federal procurement process. After carefully reading the bill, I have come to the conclusion that this is not an accurate reflection of its contents. While it is true there is a subsection dealing with the sole-sourcing of spare parts, the vast majority of the substantive provisions of this bill deal with the requirement that Federal agencies set aside all Government procurements exclusively for small business.

I have several problems with this approach. First, it is misleading to call this bill procurement reform legislation when its major effect appears to be promoting socioeconomic goals. Second, any legislation which proposes to increase competition by, in fact, limiting it is structurally flawed. The Federal marketplace should be open to all qualified firms able to fully compete for the Government's business. Third, the primary purpose of the Federal procurement process is to provide needed goods and services to the Government at the lowest cost. Use of the procurement process for other purposes can substantially increase costs to the Government. Finally, it is inherently unfair to turn over the Federal marketplace to any single economic group to the exclusion of all others.

As longtime supporter of the small business community and of the small business committee's efforts to open up Federal contracts to small business, I deeply regret that I must oppose this legislation as it now stands. However, when faced with a proposal to set aside all Federal procurements for small business, I am left with no other choice.

I include an editorial concerning H.R. 2133, which appeared in the

Washington Post on April 23, 1984, at this point in the RECORD:

THE ANTI-COMPETITION BILL

In an election year, Congress' fancy turns lightly to thoughts of mom, apple pie and . . . small business. Two years ago, its election gift to this legend-laden interest was an enlarged quota of research dollars earmarked for "small" business. This year the prize is to be a lockhold on all but the largest federal procurement contracts.

The Small Business subcommittees, which concoct these biennial atrocities, naturally deny any intention to subsidize smaller firms. The newest measure, due to come to the House floor soon, is dubbed the "Small Business Competition for Federal Procurements Act." Who could oppose more competition? If you read the fine print, however, you find that protection, not competition, is being promoted.

The bill, for example, would require all federal agencies to justify to the Small Business Administration why any purchase of goods, research or other services worth less than \$2 million should not be earmarked for small business. (Contracts worth less than \$25,000 would automatically go to small or minority business). Set-asides for small business would be required on all contracts if the agency had a "reasonable expectation" that two "responsible" small firms would offer a "reasonable" price—never mind that larger firms might offer a better price or product.

Sponsors defend these anticompetitive provisions by pointing out that agencies can always go quarrel with the SBA if they think small bidders can't perform, and that contract bids must include assurances of quality performance. But no one familiar with the red tape already required for federal procurement awards can believe that agencies will want to take on this additional burden. And anyone who believes that bidder assurances are an ironclad guarantee of performance is living in a dream world.

From time to time investigations by the General Accounting Office or Small Business Administration unearth examples of the shoddy practices that set-asides tend to produce—contractors finagle to stay "small" enough to qualify for preferences, favored firms skim profits off contracts and pass on the real work to larger subcontractors, loans are passed through to ineligible or even shady enterprises. But few legislators are brave enough to rewrite loan and set-aside programs so that they actually promote small business competition rather than create a class of firms dependent on special subsidies. Perhaps the looming fiscal crisis will give Congress the courage to defeat this latest and most overreaching demand by the small-business lobby for special preference at the taxpayers' expense.●

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ACKERMAN (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. DAUB (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the

legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Colorado) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RUDD, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ECKART) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. BROOKS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RODINO, for 60 minutes, May 8.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. GINGRICH) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COUGHLIN, for 60 minutes, on May 2.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. OLIN) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHELBY, for 60 minutes, on May 2.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Colorado) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PORTER in two instances.

Mr. COURTER.

Mrs. JOHNSON.

Mr. MCEWEN.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. HUNTER in two instances.

Mr. GREEN.

Mr. MADIGAN.

Mr. FIELDS in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ECKART) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee in 10 instances.

Mr. BONER of Tennessee in five instances.

Mr. McHUGH.

Mr. KOSTMAYER.

Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.

Mr. MARTINEZ.

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. GRAY in three instances.

Mr. OBEY in five instances.

Mr. FAZIO in two instances.

Mr. LEVINE of California.

Mr. MOAKLEY.

Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. CORRADA.
Mr. GARCIA.
Mr. WYDEN.
Mr. FRANK in three instances.
Mr. BOUCHER.
Mr. MRAZEK.
Mr. LANTOS in three instances.
Mr. BARNES in three instances.
Mr. LEVITAS.
Mr. LaFALCE.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. GUARINI.
Mr. LEHMAN of California.
Mr. MAZZOLI.
Mr. HOYER.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating the calendar week beginning with Sunday, June 3, 1984, as "National Garden Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. HAWKINS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H.R. 3867. An act to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, by impressing a trust on the commodities and sales proceeds of perishable agricultural commodities for the benefit of the unpaid seller, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5298. An act to provide for a White House Conference on Small Business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1186. An act to clear certain impediments to the licensing of the yacht *Dad's Pad* for employment in the coastwise trade; and

S.J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to designate the period commencing April 1, 1984, and ending March 31, 1985, as the "Year of Excellence in Education."

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAWKINS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On April 12, 1984:
H.J. Res. 407. Joint resolution designating the week beginning April 8, 1984, as "National Hearing Impaired Awareness Week."

On April 13, 1984:
H.R. 596. An act to transfer responsibility for furnishing certified copies of Miller Act payment bonds from the Comptroller General to the officer that awarded the contract for which the bond was given; and

H.J. Res. 466. Joint resolution designating May 1984 as "Older Americans Month."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 25, 1984, at 3 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3158. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the 1984 rural development strategy report, "Rural Communities and the American Farm: A Partnership for Progress," pursuant to Public Law 92-419, section 607(c) (94 Stat. 1171); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3159. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting notification that during the month of March the Commodity Credit Corporation made payments to the U.S. creditors on credits guaranteed by the CCC for which payments had not been received from the Polish People's Republic, pursuant to Public Law 97-257, section 306; Public Law 98-151, section 101(d); to the Committee on Appropriations.

3160. A letter from the Executive Associate Director for Budget and Legislation, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report on appropriations that have been apportioned on a basis that indicates a necessity for supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1984, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1515(b)(2); to the Committee on Appropriations.

3161. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his review of the proposed three new deferrals of budget authority contained in the message from the President dated March 26, 1984 (H. Doc. No. 98-189), pursuant to Public Law 93-344, section 1014(b) and (c) (H. Doc. No. 98-209); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3162. A letter from the Executive Director, Civil Air Patrol, transmitting the 1984 report and financial audit, pursuant to Public Law 88-504, section 3 (36 U.S.C. 1103); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3163. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporations' ninth annual report of the Office of Consumer Programs, pursuant to the act of September 26, 1914, chapter 311, section 18(f)(6) (88 Stat. 2197; 93 Stat. 95; 94 Stat. 174) to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

3164. A letter from the Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, Federal National Mortgage Association, transmitting the 1983 annual report on Fannie Mae; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

3165. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the sixth annual report on the administration of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, pursuant to Public Law 90-321, section 815(a) (91 Stat. 882); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

3166. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, "Annual Report on the Boxing and Wrestling Commission," pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 455(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3167. A letter from the Public Defender Service, District of Columbia, transmitting the annual report for fiscal year 1982 of the Public Defender Service Board of Trustees, pursuant to Public Law 91-358, section 306(a); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3168. A letter from the Director, Office of Dependents Schools, Department of Defense, transmitting the annual test report for school year 1983-84 for the overseas dependents' schools administered by the Department of Defense, pursuant to Public Law 95-561, section 1405(b); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3169. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of proposed final regulations to provide assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities and arrangements for education of children where local educational agencies cannot provide suitable free public education, pursuant to GEPA, section 431(d)(1) (88 Stat. 567; 90 Stat. 2231; 95 Stat. 453); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3170. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's fifth annual report on the implementation of the prohibition against age discrimination in federally assisted programs, pursuant to Public Law 94-135, section 308(b) (92 Stat. 1556); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3171. A letter from the Secretary of labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3172. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the eighth annual report on the automotive fuel economy program, pursuant to Public Law 92-513, section 502(a)(2) (89 Stat. 902); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3173. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting notice of additional time needed to render a final decision in Finance Docket No. 30202, et al., Seaboard System Railroad, Inc. and Southern Railway Company—Purchase and Trackage Rights—Between Maplesville and Montgomery, Ala., pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 11345(e) (94 Stat. 1932); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3174. A letter from the Chairman, Task Force on Environmental Cancer and Heart Lung Disease, transmitting its sixth annual report covering the period September 1982 through August 1983, pursuant to Public Law 95-95, section 402; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3175. A letter from the Chairman, National Arthritis Advisory Board, transmitting the Board's supplement to its 1983 annual report (Executive Communication No. 1247), pursuant to section 437(j) of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3176. A letter from the Acting Director, U.S. International Development Coopera-

tion Agency, transmitting a report on the Agency's famine prevention and freedom from hunger activities during fiscal year 1983, pursuant to FAA, section 300 (89 Stat. 866) 22 U.S.C. subpart xii; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3177. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting copies of Presidential Determinations No. 84-6, dated April 3, 1984, and No. 84-7, dated April 19, 1984, and justifications therefore concerning defense articles and defense services to the Government of Grenada and the Government of St. Christopher and Nevis, pursuant to AECA, section 3(a)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3178. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Navy's proposed offer to sell certain defense articles and services to Korea (Transmittal No. 84-42), pursuant to AECA, section 36(b) (90 Stat. 741; 93 Stat. 708, 709, 710; 94 Stat. 3134; 95 Stat. 1520); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3179. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Army's proposed offer to sell certain defense articles and services to Italy (Transmittal No. 84-41), pursuant to AECA, section 36(b) (90 Stat. 741; 93 Stat. 708, 709, 710; 94 Stat. 3134; 95 Stat. 1520); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3180. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the price and availability report for the quarter ended March 31, 1984, pursuant to AECA, section 28 (93 Stat. 708; 95 Stat. 1520); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3181. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of a proposed lease of defense articles to the Government of Portugal (Transmittal No. 12-84), pursuant to AECA, section 62 (a) or (b) (95 Stat. 1525); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3182. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report on voluntary contributions by the United States to international organizations for the period April 1983-September 1983, pursuant to FAA, section 306(b)(1) (94 Stat. 3157); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3183. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus problem, including any relevant reports from the Secretary General of the United Nations, pursuant to FAA, section 620(c) (92 Stat. 739) (H. Doc. No. 98-208); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

3184. A letter from the Acting Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112(b) (92 Stat. 993); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3185. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112(b) (92 Stat. 993); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3186. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the annual report on the performance of functions and duties of the Office of Management and Budget and the Department of the Treasury, pursuant to Public Law 91-510, section 202(f) (88 Stat. 327); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3187. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Federal Procurement Policy, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report on the extent of competition in the award of subcontracts by Federal prime contractors including an evaluation of subcontracts awarded in fiscal year 1982, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 415(b) (97 Stat. 1330) (Public Law 93-400, section 17(b)); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3188. A letter from the Administrator, Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a notice of new Federal records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3189. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting notice of a proposed new records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3190. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting a report of the Board's activities under the Government in the Sunshine Act during calendar year 1983, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3191. A letter from the Chairman, Office of Environmental Quality, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the annual report of its activities under the Freedom of Information Act covering calendar year 1983, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3192. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Administration), transmitting notice of a proposed new records system submitted by the Defense Logistics Agency, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3193. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a report of its activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1983, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3194. A letter from the Executive Director, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's report of its activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1983, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3195. A letter from the Staff Director, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting the seventh annual report of the Commission's activities under the Government in the Sunshine Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3196. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Lands and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on the implementation of the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982, pursuant to Public Law 97-451, section 302(a); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3197. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, transmitting the final report on the Council's review of the Federal Highway Administration's proposed assistance to the Alabama Highway Department in the construction of Interstate 210, pursuant to Public Law 89-665, section 202(b) (94 Stat. 2999); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3198. A letter from the Secretaries of Commerce and the Interior, and the Executive Director, Marine Mammal Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation

to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 through fiscal year 1987, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3199. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to eliminate the requirement for a decennial census of drainage, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

3200. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting a report on the effectiveness of the civil aviation security program, pursuant to Public Law 85-726, section 315(a) (88 Stat. 415); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3201. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 10, 1979, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Eight Mile Creek, Paragould, Ark. The report is in partial response to resolutions adopted by the Senate Public Works Committee on March 27, 1967, and the House of Representatives Committee on Public Works on October 19, 1967, (H. Doc. No. 98-210); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and ordered to be printed.

3202. A letter from the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 201(b) of Public Law 96-22; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3203. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to simplify the administration, contain escalating costs and create greater flexibility in the operation of programs under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Agriculture.

3204. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a study of existing and alternative programs for improving quality assurance and quality control in the construction of commercial nuclear powerplants, pursuant to Public Law 97-415, section 13(d); jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

3205. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a report on the progress made by the VA in its work on the development of staffing guidelines for the VA's medical center activities; jointly, to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Appropriations.

3206. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to require furnishing of hospital services to certain uniformed services dependents and retired personnel at medicare rates, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

3207. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on guidelines for rescuing large failing firms and municipalities (GAO/GGD-84-34; March 29, 1984); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations; Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on April 12, 1984, the following report was filed on April 13, 1984]

Mr. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 3678. A bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources and the improvement and rehabilitation of the Nation's water resources infrastructure; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-616, Pt. IV). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted April 18, 1984]

Mr. NICHOLS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 5064. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for more cost effective and efficient purchases of spare parts by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98-690). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Pursuant to the order of the House on April 10, 1984, the following report was filed on April 19, 1984]

Mr. PRICE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 5167. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1985 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, for operation and maintenance, and for working capital funds, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces and for civilian employees of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-691). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted April 24, 1984]

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. Report on confusion in the legal framework of the American financial system and services industry (Rept. No. 98-692). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ST GERMAIN: Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. H.R. 4361. A bill to promote the commercial application and diffusion of advanced technology within industrial sectors; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98-693, Pt. I). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ST GERMAIN: Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. H.R. 4009. A bill to modernize the Federal Reserve System; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98-694). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ST GERMAIN: Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. H.R. 5278. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to increase the number of class C directors of Federal Reserve banks (Rept. No. 98-695). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 3457. A bill to prohibit the payment of certain agriculture incentives to persons who produce certain agricultural commodities on highly erodible land; to allow farmers who plant perennial grasses and legumes as a means of building soil quality, rotating crops, or protecting land

from wind and water erosion, to enter a certified voluntary set-aside program; and to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into long-term contracts with farmers to remove certain erosion-prone lands from cultivation; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-696). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. ST GERMAIN: Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. H.R. 4360. A bill to improve the industrial competitiveness of the United States; referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a period ending not later than June 8, 1984 for consideration of such provisions of sections 1 through 3 and title I of the bill and amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(h), Rule X (Rept. No. 98-697, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE:

H.R. 5501. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to make it clear that States and local governments may not tax social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS of Illinois:

H.R. 5502. A bill to provide that the availability of extended and supplemental unemployment benefits shall be determined by using the total unemployment rate and that such benefits may be made available on an area basis within a State, and to extend the supplemental unemployment program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STOKES (for himself, Mr.

BONER of Tennessee, Mr. DIXON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LELAND, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GRAY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. HALL of Indiana, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. EDGAR, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 5503. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to provide financial assistance to minority students in the health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOLAND (for himself, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. CONTE):

H.J. Res. 551. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Anne Legendre Armstrong as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.J. Res. 552. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr. as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BREAUX (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROE, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. RODINO, Mr. MINISH, Mr. COURTER, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. McKERNAN, Mr. TALLON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. CARPER, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. LENT, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. HOYER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. VANDERGRIF, Mr. DIXON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FROST, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DYSON, Mr. STUDDS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FISH, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. HAYES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. OWENS, Mr. McGRATH, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DAUB, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. FOGLETTA):

H.J. Res. 553. Joint resolution designating the Brigantine and Barnegat units of the National Wildlife Refuge System as the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EVANS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. MINETA, Mr. CROCKETT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FRANK, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. ECKART, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Mr. CLINGER):

H. Con. Res. 293. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to using the total unemployment rate as the basis for determining the availability of extended and supplemental benefits for the unemployed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

366. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, relative to the medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

367. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to the establishment of an Arthritis Institute within the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

368. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to nuclear weapons testing in the Pacific Basin; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

369. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to American prisoners in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

370. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to the distilled spirits program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

371. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to barriers to trade in wine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 11: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 659: Mr. OWENS and Mr. BROWN of Colorado.
H.R. 871: Mr. MATSUI.
H.R. 1087: Mr. GUARINI.
H.R. 1244: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 1797: Mr. GIBBONS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. PRICE, Mr. SHANNON, and Mr. ROSE.
H.R. 1918: Mr. BROWN of California.
H.R. 2053: Mr. GEPHARDT.
H.R. 2125: Mr. MINISH.
H.R. 2847: Mr. DOWNEY of New York and Ms. MIKULSKI.
H.R. 2886: Mrs. BOXER.
H.R. 2996: Mr. McCURDY, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. KASICH, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. GOODLING.
H.R. 3105: Mr. MINISH.
H.R. 3734: Mr. SCHAEFER.
H.R. 4162: Mr. HARTNETT.
H.R. 4207: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 4287: Mr. FOWLER.
H.R. 4375: Ms. SNOWE.
H.R. 4402: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ASPIN, and Mr. BATES.
H.R. 4404: Mr. LOWRY of Washington.
H.R. 4440: Mr. HARKIN.
H.R. 4673: Mr. HYDE.
H.R. 4740: Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. HANSEN of Utah.
H.R. 4772: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MARTIN of New York, and Mr. SOLARZ.
H.R. 5076: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. YATRON.
H.R. 5169: Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. SIMON, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. WEAVER, and Mr. MINISH.
H.R. 5223: Mr. PENNY, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina.
H.R. 5302: Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 5459: Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. KINDNESS, and Mr. SKEEN.
H.R. 5460: Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. KINDNESS, and Mr. SKEEN.
H.J. Res. 153: Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, and Mr. MOODY.
H.J. Res. 233: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. HUGHES.
H.J. Res. 451: Mr. BARNES, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. RUSSO, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. ALBOSTA.
H.J. Res. 452: Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BRITT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr.

RODINO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. GORE, Mr. SHARP, Mr. STARK, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.J. Res. 458: Mr. VENTO, Mr. LOTT, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GEJDESEN, Mr. SABO, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. COOPER, Mr. YATRON, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SHARP, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. GORE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. GREGG, Mr. GRAY, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. BARNES, and Mr. LUJAN.

H.J. Res. 484: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DYSON, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. HALL of Indiana, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MOODY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. VANDERGRIFF, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GORE, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi.

H.J. Res. 497: Mr. HARRISON, Mr. WINN, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BRITT, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 499: Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. WOLF, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. MacKAY, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. HOYER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SAM B. HALL, Jr., Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. LONG of Louisiana.

H.J. Res. 509: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BETHUNE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. COATS, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HANSEN of Utah, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. HILER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MICA, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROE, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WINN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GORE, and Mr. HAMILTON.

H.J. Res. 527: Mr. WILSON, Mr. GORE, and Mr. FRENZEL.

H.J. Res. 529: Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. SKELTON.

H.J. Res. 539: Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BATES, Mr. GEPHARDT,

Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. LUKEN.

H.J. Res. 540: Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WEISS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SIMON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. FORD of Michigan.

H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. BROWN of California.

H. Con. Res. 239: Mr. GUARINI.

H. Con. Res. 251: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. CONYERS.

H. Con. Res. 267: Mr. MINISH.

H. Con. Res. 277: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DeWINE, and Mr. HUNTER.

H. Con. Res. 284: Mr. BERREUTER.

H. Res. 171: Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. ECKART, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. PORTER, Mr. APPELGADE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. REID, Mr. YATRON, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. ANDERSON, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. DeWINE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. MINISH, Mr. COURTER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. St GERMAIN, Mr. MOLINARI, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LENT, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. DAUB, Mr. GREGG, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. McNULTY, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Res. 450: Mr. RUDD, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. AuCOIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. COURTER, Mr. WINN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BATES, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. OBEY, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. DUNCAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

341. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William E. Conrad, Florissant, Mo., relative to the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

342. Also, petition of the Ninth Circuit District Judges Association, Tucson, Ariz., relative to H.R. 4307, relating to the rates of compensation for attorneys appointed under the Criminal Justice Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

343. Also, petition of the city council, city and county of Honolulu, Hawaii, relative to the reauthorization of mortgage revenue bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

344. Also, petition of the common council, Syracuse, N.Y., relative to mortgage revenue bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

345. Also, petition of the Legislature of Erie County, Buffalo, N.Y., relative to mortgage bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4974

By Mr. BOEHLERT:

—On page 3, after line 3, insert the following new subsection:

(d) In the obligation, use, and expenditure of the amounts authorized under subsection (a)(3) for Biotic Systems and Resources and the amounts authorized under subsection (a)(4) for Atmospheric Sciences, major em-

phasis shall be placed on basic scientific research to support a better understanding of the environmental processes that contribute to acid rain.

H.R. 5172

By Mr. RUDD:

—Beginning on page 7, line 1, strike the entire Sec. 204.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

KIM DAE JUNG

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kim Dae Jung, the exiled Korean dissident leader, recently issued a statement which outlines his views and proposals regarding Korea. Mr. Kim was in 1971 the opposition candidate for President. Since that time he has been in prison 5½ years, under house arrest 3½ years and in exile 2 years. He is a courageous advocate for basic freedoms in his country, and is an inspiration to the many Koreans who are working for liberalization and a return to democracy in Korea. His eloquent statement should enlighten us all, and I ask that it be made a part of the RECORD.

THE DESTINY OF THE KOREAN NATION AT THE CROSSROADS: MY VIEWS AND PROPOSALS

(By Kim Dae Jung)

[From the April, 1984 issue of Conscience in Action, published by the Korean Institute for Human Rights]

A fierce popular struggle for democracy is looming large in South Korea. Few doubt that the struggle for democracy will erupt this spring—led first by students and then joined by the general public. It will be the most intense and widespread struggle in the four years of the Chun Doo Hwan regime, and physical force will not be able to put it down.

The Korean people and the Chun Doo Hwan regime are at a fateful crossroads, and so are the United States and Japan, countries which have been supportive of the Chun regime. I want to share my thoughts on these critical issues. What is the truth about the predicament in which the Korean nation is deeply mired? How can we overcome this crisis without violence and tragedy?

Fundamentally, the solution lies in the restoration of democracy wherein the freely-formed and freely-expressed opinions of the Korean people can not only be honored but can also serve as the standard for national judgment and decision making. Within the framework of this fundamental solution, I want to offer my beliefs on the national agenda.

I. THE ROAD TO DEMOCRATIC REFORM

A. Relinquishing power at the end of one term in 1988—not the answer

Chun Doo Hwan has publicly pledged that he will step down after completing one term in office in March, 1988. He claims that this will break the ground for the first peaceful transfer of power in the history of the Republic. Though I doubt that Chun Doo Hwan will indeed step down in 1988, this is not the real issue. Rather, it should be made unequivocally clear that his departure from

office will not constitute a peaceful change of power by democratic process.

A genuine, peaceful change of administrations is possible only when the people freely and without fear exercise their rights as masters of the nation. Under the present circumstances, there is no guarantee of the people's sovereignty founded in such basic rights as free elections and freedom of the press, and thus political change means nothing. It is a mere relay of power between dictators in which another Chun Doo Hwan can be imposed upon the South Korean people.

The pivotal issue, therefore, is not one of "serving one term until 1988" but whether the people have the freedom to choose and change their government. This issue is of prime importance.

B. The danger of a constitutional amendment for direct election of the Korean President

I must warn that there is danger in a constitutional amendment for the direct election of the president. Recently, there has been much ballyhoo about direct presidential elections in the government-manipulated media and among "opposition parties". They are misleading the people into thinking that direct elections are the way to restore democracy. The Chun regime feigns an opposition to all these talks while either acquiescing to or encouraging them behind the scenes. I have to warn that any move toward faith in direct presidential elections is based on faulty reasoning and also runs the risk of being ensnared in one of the dictatorial regime's ploys.

First, direct election of the president does not in and of itself constitute democracy. A great number of Caribbean republics are exemplary dictatorships in spite of direct presidential elections. On the other hand, the United States represents a well-established democratic society, although it elects its president indirectly.

Second, to expect that the Chun regime and the current National Assembly which serves the Chun regime at its pleasure could enact a democratic constitution is like climbing to the top of a tree to catch a fish.

Third, a constitutional amendment at this time for the direct election of the president runs a great risk of providing the Chun dictatorship with a facade of legitimacy and opens the way for perpetuation of its rule after 1988.

It goes without saying that the current dictatorial constitution born out of the May 17, 1981 coup should be revised. The revision, however, should be wholesale in scope and not of a patch-up variety involving only changes such as the method of presidential election. The first step should be a temporary return to the constitution of the pre-Yushin Third Republic.

Even though the constitution of the Third Republic was adopted during the Park Chung Hee era, all of us had a hand in its drafting, and adhered to and guarded it for ten years. Further, its substance is more than adequate as the legal foundation for realizing a democratic Korea. It is also important to set a precedent of restoring a constitution by popular will, a constitution

which brute force abolished in spite of popular support. We should return not only to the pre-Yushin constitution but also to the laws governing the press and elections.

I want to make known to our people and the world my view that this is a most urgent agenda item in our struggle for democracy. It is also my fervent hope that all opposition forces will come around to this view and make concerted efforts to bring it into reality.

C. Improvement of human rights to be preceded by structural improvements

Genuine improvements in human rights are not possible without first reforming the system itself. Recently, the Chun Doo Hwan regime has released students from prison and allowed them to return to school. It has also taken steps to allow professors fired for political reasons to return to university life and lifted bans on political activity for some politicians. These measures should be welcomed regardless of what the underlying motives might be.

It is clear that these actions do not represent a genuine improvement of human rights. This is because, although their rights have been restored to some extent, these students and professors should not have been imprisoned or fired in the first place. It has also been proven in the case of the Park Chung Hee regime that without institutional and legal reforms, liberalization undertaken out of necessity or whims of a dictator can always revert to repression for the same reasons. Human rights are fundamental, not to be given out at the pleasure of a dictator. This is why human rights can not be advanced without freedom of political activity, a free press, free elections, freedom for labor to organize, freedom to protest, and freedom of assembly.

If the ostensibly liberalizing measures are intended to improve the image of the Chun regime at home and abroad or to earn an excuse for subsequent repression, they are an affront to human rights. In a survey conducted during the current dictatorial regime, 80 percent of the Korean people demanded that human rights and democracy should be restored even if this means slowing down economic growth. This is the reason for my demand of a wholesale revision of the laws pertaining to protest, assembly, and agricultural cooperative unions. I also demand the abolition of the basic laws governing the press, and the reinstatement of the election laws of the Third Republic.

D. Implementation of local autonomy—indispensable

The implementation of the system of local autonomy is indispensable. Local autonomy is essential to parliamentary democracy. The system of local autonomy gives the people a training ground where they may gain political experience. It is an ubiquitous phenomenon found everywhere irrespective of ideology. By shunning it, the Chun regime is only undermining its loud proclamation that it is moving toward political development.

Even during the Korean Conflict some thirty years ago, there was a system of local autonomy. The centralization of power

since then, however, has produced extremely abnormal growth in Seoul to an extent unmatched anywhere else in the world—i.e., 10 million people or 25 percent of the South Korean population and nearly 70 percent of the currency in circulation are now concentrated in the capital city. Such imbalance poses a threat to the political, economic, and social stability of our nation. Further, it gravely endangers national security, which, after all, is proclaimed by the Chun regime as the consummate mission. The reason for the suspension of local autonomy during the last 23 years under Park Chung Hee and Chun Doo Hwan is rather obvious. Local autonomy would have impeded the efforts of the dictators to establish complete control over the people through effective repression. It is often argued by those in power that the dependency of local finance on the central government is the main factor in delaying the implementation of local autonomy. We must reject such a pretext as nothing more than a gratuitous subterfuge used to sabotage the promotion of local autonomy, and we must categorically demand the restoration of the system of local autonomy as quickly as possible.

E. National Security—unthinkable without a democratic government

National security is unthinkable without a democratic government. We have an army that is 600,000 strong and an additional 40,000 troops stationed in our land. South Korea's population is twice that of North Korea's, and its GNP is 4.8 times the size of the north's. In spite of such superiority, the South Korean government has constantly warned that the south faces an imminent danger of being communized by the north. As a result, the South Korean people are living in chronic fear because of this national security question.

What is the explanation for the problem of weakened security despite the quantitative superiority which we enjoy? In a nutshell, our national security has been weakened because the government lacks the spontaneous support of the people. This lack of support stems from the denial of democratic freedoms and social and economic justice for the South Korean people.

Only a democratic government can guarantee freedom, justice, and human dignity to the people. Without democratic government, political and social stability is inconceivable. By the same token, national security is possible only when the political situation is stable and society is free from tension and contradictions. Only then will the communists in the north be forced to abandon their design of conquering the south. This will finally open the door for meaningful dialogue and cooperation between the south and the north on an equal basis, and a peaceful resolution of the problems on the Korean peninsula will be thinkable.

Using national security as a pretext for authoritarian politics is alien to Korean political history. Even during the Korean Conflict, we enjoyed a free press, local autonomy, independent legislative and judicial branches, and direct election of the president. Because our people cherished these democratic freedoms, they dedicated their lives to repelling the more than one-million-strong North Korean and Chinese forces. This vivid experience not only proves untenable the argument for a dictatorship justified for security reasons but also confirms the inseparable relationship between genuine national security and democratic freedoms. I emphasize once again that authoritarian politics under the pretext of national

security is sheer dictatorial demagoguery and that democratic politics is a *sine qua non* for national security.

F. The need for a free market system

We need the free market system. We have expanded our economy substantially during the last 20 years in spite of the corruption and policy errors of those in power. This is without question due to the superior qualities of our people who are diligent, highly educated, and superbly skilled and trained. Unfortunately, as our economy continues to grow, so do its problems. We are now saddled with a foreign debt amounting to \$40 billion. Our economy is dependent on foreign trade for nearly 80 percent of its GNP; this underlines the dependent nature of our economy. Above all, economic imbalances and contradictions are manifesting themselves in various sectors of the economy—i.e., in the disparity between big business, on the one hand, and small- and middle-sized businesses on the other; between export and non-export industries; between heavy chemical and light industries; between urban and rural areas; and between regions. What could be most destructive, however, is the gap between the rich and the poor.

In South Korea today, only 10 financial groups account for half of the GNP. They virtually control heavy chemical and light industries, and financial institutions. At the same time, stocks of these financial groups are owned by only a handful of families. Such concentration of control cannot be found in any economy under the democratic rubric. On the other hand, 50 percent of the workers earn less than \$125 a month, not even enough to meet half of their monthly expenses. 90 percent of farm households are struggling with burdensome debts. This kind of inequity is the product of collusion between political power and wealth. This is the root of political corruption as well.

Naturally, popular discontent has been heightened, and the rich have become the target of national hatred. This is why there is a marriage of necessity between power and money in the form of a military dictatorship which uses the alleged crisis of national security to counter popular concern for justice, freedom, and equity.

History shows that economic growth is feasible even under dictatorships but that the growth will not produce a fair distribution of wealth or a balanced growth among various economic sectors and strata. For the sake of sound and effective economic development, I strongly advocate the adoption of a genuine free market system. I also believe in the fair distribution of income and the popular shareholding of stocks. All this will require tax reform and new financial and labor policies. We will then be able to attain the kind of economic growth which is characterized by the trinity of stability, growth, and distribution.

II. THE ROAD TO PEACE AND UNIFICATION

A. Democratization of the South and cooperation of the four powers: The keys to peace and unification

The keys to the issue of peace and unification are the restoration of democracy in the south and the cooperation of the four powers, China, Japan, the Soviet Union, and the United States. In response to the north's proposal for a three-party conference, South Korea has voiced opposition. The United States and Japan have countered with a proposal for a four-way talk; and China and the Soviet Union have sided with North Korea. These confusions notwithstanding, I believe that a south-north

conference is likely. The forthcoming trip of President Reagan to China may very well serve as a catalyst for dramatic progress on this issue.

I welcome any type of a conference as long as it contributes to the reduction of tension on the Korean peninsula. If any south-north talk is going to succeed, the United States, Japan, China, and the Soviet Union must cooperate even though they may not be direct participants in the talks. Without their cooperation, peace on the Korean peninsula cannot be expected.

At the same time, a democratic South Korean government with popular support is a prerequisite to laying the foundation for a south-north dialogue and for permanent peace on the peninsula. All in all, a democratic South Korean and four-power cooperation are the two preconditions for a meeting between the south and the north.

B. Advocacy of a Republican Federal system

I support a "republican federal" system. I think that it is premature to attempt the "federal republican" system as advocated by North Korea because it implies the creation of a unitary government. As a first step toward unification, it appears desirable to adopt the "republican federal" system in which each side will remain an independent republic under the rubric of a federation. The south, according to this formula, will recognize de facto and de jure the existence of the north which, in turn, will reciprocate by guaranteeing the existence of a democratic government in the south.

Both republics will work to promote mutual understanding and trust and, by mutual agreement, transfer their powers gradually to the federation to the extent feasible within the context of their trust and understanding of each other. Such a step toward eventual, complete unification is the rational and the practical solution.

C. The restoration of democracy—precondition for unification

Restoration of democracy that does not have unification as its goal can not be a democracy that is resonant with the desires of the people. Further, such a government would become dictatorial as it begins to suppress the popular aspiration for unification. The advocates of democracy can not call themselves truly democratic unless they dedicate themselves fully to the task of unification so fervently desired by the South Korean people.

The restoration of democracy and unification are equally important. In terms of agenda setting, however, the former should precede the latter because a peaceful and democratic unification is inconceivable without democracy. No matter how loudly they proclaim their interest in unification, dictators can never be genuinely committed to this national goal because division and tension are necessary for the maintenance of dictatorship. Unification, therefore, is antithetical to the vested interests of the dictatorships on the Korean peninsula. We learned this lesson first during the Park Chung Hee era and this compels me to emphasize the following.

First, for the sake of our nation and posterity, we should maintain a firm resolve to strive for unification. In addition, the people should be allowed to participate freely and actively in a national debate on unification, thereby strengthening and mobilizing our capability for unification.

Second, unification should be approached both with fiery passion and with reason. This demands our wisdom and efforts to

bring about national reconciliation. We must respect the interests of those in the north, and the interests of the south must also be respected. Our wisdom and efforts can increase international cooperation, including that of the four powers.

Third, until the day when we finally attain complete unification, we should devote ourselves to the task of lessening animosity between South and North Korea, thus reducing the possibility of military confrontation, and restoring a sense of togetherness as one nation.

III. CONCLUSION

In concluding, I want to make clear my desires and appeals to the various communities concerned with and involved in the fate of the Korean nation. At the same time, I want to disclose my personal resolutions.

First, the Chun Doo Hwan regime will no longer be able to manipulate the Korean people. Repression, political deception and chicanery will no longer work. The continuation of the present situation will only spell trouble and misfortune for the Korean people as well as for those in power. I want to issue a caveat that promoting popularly-desired democracy is the only way for the Chun regime to atone for its crimes against the nation and to avert the fate that befell its predecessor.

It is my firm personal belief that should the Chun regime critically examine itself and then join in the national effort to restore democracy, we, the proponents of democracy, will be ready to welcome it and work to prevent any type of political vendetta.

Second, I want to speak to the United States government. In spite of our many disappointments about the United States Korean policy, we give full credit to President Reagan for his emphasis on democracy and human rights, during his visit to Korea. It should also be noted that the State Department's annual human rights reports have touched upon some of the fundamental human rights issues in South Korea.

The Korean people, however, view the United States as fully supportive of the dictator and hold it responsible for Japan's cooperation with the dictatorship because they believe that Japan is merely following in the footsteps of the United States. There have been many unfortunate incidents in South Korea which are indicative of anti-Americanism. As I assess the flow of public opinion and the movements on college campuses of the past few months, I have to conclude that the United States today faces a choice between the dictator and the Korean people. I call upon the United States government to take necessary measures to restore the confidence of the Korean people in the United States as the ally and supporter of democracy and human rights just as its actions suggested during the April 19 Student Revolution of 1960.

We are not requesting that the United States restore democracy for us but only that it change its attitude that has been either acquiescent or has resulted in support for the military dictatorship since the December 12, 1979 coup. The United States should make unequivocal its support for a democratic process and system in which the people can determine their future through the vehicles of free speech, free press, and free elections. The United States, of course, can not interfere with the internal politics of South Korea in an attempt to help restore democracy in Korea. It can, however, encourage the process of democratization by effectively using trade and aid as a leverage.

If the United States can do this much, we can carry the ball the rest of the way.

Third, I want to appeal to the Korean people. Democracy should be the prize of our conviction, efforts, and sacrifices. Restoring democracy can not simply happen. It has its price, and it is the people, the master of the democratic system, who must pay the price. Conscience that does not act is a friend of evil. It is only when the majority of our people participate in the struggle for democracy that we can bring about a democratic revolution.

We have to realize also that the success of our democratic movement and our own interests dictate that the national struggle be non-violent and not harm basic friendships with our allies.

I also urge Korean-Americans to be aware of the special mission with which they have been entrusted by our nation. Because the Chun regime hangs on not due to popular support but thanks to American and Japanese support, you should work hard to move the United States to change its current policy of supporting the dictatorship so that it will be in line with our national aspirations for democracy. Korean residents in the United States should view helping to free their forty million brothers and sisters living in Korea from military dictatorship as a mission of the highest order.

Finally, since my arrival in the United States about 15 months ago, I have made continuous efforts to help correct mistaken United States Korean policy. I have contacted leaders of the administration, the United States Congress, the media, academia, religious communities, and various human rights activist groups. This, I believe, is my greatest service to our people and a mission that has been fatefully placed on my shoulders.

My efforts have been widely supported by Korean-Americans and have been based in the demands put forward by my democratic compatriots. We can not let the United States repeat its acquiescence to or support of wanton acts of violence by some soldiers who would slaughter our people and democracy. My mission is to persuade the United States to lend its hand of support to our long-cherished dream of a democratic Korea.

My preoccupation is not with my own political future. My concern is my sense of mission in the United States and how to be most effective in pursuing it. My greatest wish is to return home, to be able to again stand shoulder to shoulder with my beloved brothers and sisters in Korea. I sincerely and humbly ask for the support of our allies and of my fellow Koreans now residing in the United States and elsewhere. ●

WILL SALT SURVIVE PAST 1985?

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● **Mr. BARNES.** Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago several newspapers carried a report indicating that the Reagan administration might consider abandoning U.S. observance of the SALT I and II agreements after the unratified SALT II provisions expire in December 1985. An administration official was quoted as saying that a determination would be based on the existing

international situation and our own national security requirements.

Arms control is an incremental process, each successive step building on previous gains. In this period of historic peril, arms control is more essential to our national security than ever before—we should not undercut the process, but continue to strengthen it.

I commend to my colleagues the following Washington Post report on the subject:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 30, 1984]

UNITED STATES MAY DROP LIMITS OF SALT AT END OF 1985

(By Don Oberdorfer)

The Reagan administration yesterday raised the possibility that it may cease observing previously agreed U.S.-Soviet strategic arms limitations at the end of next year, depending on "the international situation and our own national security requirements" at the time.

A statement released by the State Department indicated that decision would be made late next year before planned sea trials for the seventh Trident ballistic missile submarine.

The launching of that submarine with 24 nuclear-armed ballistic missiles could place the United States arsenal above the agreed limits of both the ratified SALT I treaty and the unratified SALT II treaty with the Soviets, the statement said.

U.S.-Soviet negotiations on a future strategic arms agreement have been stymied since December, when the Soviets refused to set a date for a new round of talks following the deployment of new U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe.

Failure to continue observing the SALT I and SALT II limits would be an even more serious development which could eliminate the remaining rules of restraint between the superpowers in the nuclear arms field.

Until now, according to the statement, the United States has been dismantling enough older Polaris and Titan II missiles to stay within the limits agreed with the Soviets in the 1972 SALT I treaty despite deployment of new U.S. missiles. This is in line with a policy of President Reagan that the United States will refrain from actions which "undercut" strategic arms agreements so long as the Soviet Union "shows equal restraint."

Yesterday's statement laid the groundwork for possibly abandoning this position by saying that "no decision need be taken at this time" whether to continue to dismantle older weapons when the seventh Trident submarine is launched late in 1985.

The statement noted that the unratified SALT II treaty, which Reagan opposed but he has not been "undercutting," would expire in December, 1985, if it had been ratified.

"The United States will carefully evaluate both the international situation and our own national security requirements" in deciding what to do about the future limitations, the statement said.

The first indication that the administration was not determined to continue observing strategic arms limits came in testimony by Secretary of State George P. Shultz Wednesday before a Senate Appropriations subcommittee.

Questioned about administration intentions regarding the scheduled late 1985 Trident launching, Shultz ducked a precise answer but said of the arms control limit,

"It's not forever, and that's as true for us as it is for them."●

**ESSEX COUNTY COLLEGE
HERITAGE SYMPOSIUM**

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 28, I will have the honor of being a keynote speaker at the Heritage Symposium of Essex County College in downtown Newark. The symposium, which will explore the rich ethnic and cultural history of Essex County, will celebrate the tricentennial of Essex County and the 15th anniversary of Essex County College.

To increase awareness of ethnic identity, the day-long symposium will examine the history, culture, and literature of the county's early settlers and the growth and development of its diverse ethnic groups. These groups include blacks, Hispanics, Jews, Anglo-Saxons, Irish, Polish, Dutch, Scandinavians, Germans, Italians, Chinese, Vietnamese, Ukrainians, and Portuguese.

Featured presentations will be made by two prominent New Jersey historians. Clement Alexander Price, director of the Graduate history program at Rutgers University-Newark will address "The Peopling of Essex County," from the mid-17th century to World War I. Howard L. Green, research director of the New Jersey Historical Commission, will discuss "Social Change in Essex County" from World War I to the present.

Others who will make keynote remarks are Peter Shapiro, Essex County executive; Jerome Greco, president of the Board of Chosen Freeholders, and Kenneth A. Gibson, mayor of Newark.

The sponsors of this ambitious exploration of three centuries of cultural pluralism in Essex County are the New Jersey Committee on the Humanities, a State program of the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the 2-year college's multilingual outreach program, whose director is Ms. Mila Salazar-Bruan.

Cosponsors include Howard Savings Institutions, Midlantic Banks, the Newark Public Library, New Jersey Bell, the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, Public Service Electric & Gas, National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Clubs, National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Portuguese Sport Club of New Jersey and the Ukrainian Congress Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I took part in the dedication of Essex County College, and I am proud of the important role it has played in our community in its brief history. Under the leadership of its

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

president, Dr. A. Zachary Yamba, the downtown campus and the off-campus facilities serve well the needs of our diverse communities. The college provides an exciting academic experience for 6,000 full- and part-time students who range from teenagers to senior citizens and who represent 40 countries. Faculty and staff reflect this wide diversity of ethnic groups.

The college and this symposium show once again that we are a people of many tongues and voices who value our diverse inheritances and who nourish this pluralism, this individuality and originality, even as we work together to bring about a just and fair and an equal society for all.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES F. McNULTY, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I regret to report I was unable to be present in the House of Representatives to record my vote on House Resolution 485 and House Concurrent Resolution 290, prohibiting funds to mine Nicaraguan ports. An emergency in my district in southeastern Arizona required my attention. Had I been able to be present for the vote I would have voted in favor of the rule and in favor of the House concurrent resolution.

I would hope the RECORD can reflect these votes.

I thank you for your courtesy in this matter.●

**COMMEMORATE THE
UKRAINIAN FAMINE OF 1933**

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, on November 17, 1983, the House passed House Concurrent Resolution 111 commemorating the Ukrainian famine of 1933, in which nearly 8 million innocent Ukrainian men, women, and children died of starvation or in places of penal exile as a result of the barbarous policies of the Soviet Russian Government.

I strongly urge my colleagues in the Senate to cosponsor and support Senate Concurrent Resolution 101, which is currently pending in the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I would also like to include in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the council of the city of Philadelphia in support of this important legislation.

CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,
CITATION

Whereas, Ukraine has experienced the holocaust of 1932-34 in which a loss of 8

million of the population of the area occurred; and

Whereas, the famine that occurred was not a punishment of God, nor caused by nature, but was organized, engineered, and master-minded by the Russian Communist regime in Ukraine. (And was so stated in a New York Times editorial in 1933); and

Whereas, the production figures of grain in 1932-33 showed that it was possible for the crop to feed the population for over 2 years. It was the forced collectivization of grain and food imposed upon the Ukrainian people against their will by the Russian Communist regime that was the true cause of the famine; and

Whereas, it was the special detachments of the GPU, as well as the Red army soldiers, sent by Moscow to Ukraine, that carried off, not only the grain but everything edible, that shot or exiled thousands of peasants, and the Kulaks (wealthy peasants) and that destroyed whole villages and turned what was the most fertile black soil into vast areas of desolate land; and

Whereas, the Russian Government refused to acknowledge the famine of 1932-34, and refused to allow aid programs established in Europe to help the starving Ukrainians, and is responsible for this man-made famine.

Therefore, the Council of the City of Philadelphia hereby urges the citizens of this country to join the Americans of Ukrainian origin in mourning the victims of the 1932-34 famine, in commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of this crime against humanity, the man-made famine of Ukraine by the Russian Communist regime.●

**KNOWLEDGE VERSUS INFORMATION—THE LIBRARY IN OUR
"INFORMATION" AGE**

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, our public libraries are one of this Nation's most valuable resources. We have just commemorated National Library Week. Although we have been quick to praise our libraries at this time, we in the Congress and many State and local officials throughout our Nation have been much slower in providing the necessary funds for the continued health of this important element of our educational and cultural infrastructure.

Americans are a book-reading people, and our libraries are an important source of the materials they read. The Book Industry Study Group recently released an extensive study of American reading habits. The proportion of Americans who read—56 percent—has remained constant over the last 6 years, despite the increased variety and volume of competition for our time—home video games, video arcades, video recorders, and home computers. Furthermore, among those who do read books, the percentage of heavy readers—those reading 26 or more books in a 6-month period—has

risen dramatically since 1978—from 18 to 35 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that despite these positive indications about Americans' reading habits, however, we may not be keeping pace with the need and demand for books and libraries. My dear friend Daniel Boorstin, who is the Librarian of Congress and an international scholar in his own right, made an important distinction between information and knowledge in a speech at a White House Conference on Library and Information Services. The "information industry" has shown spectacular growth; it is the latest example of American ingenuity, enterprise, and the frontier spirit in the late 20th century. A magic computer now accomplishes the dreariest tasks in seconds, surpasses the accuracy of the human brain, controls production lines and refineries, arranges inventories, and retrieves records.

But as Dr. Boorstin notes, "while information industry flourishes and seeks new avenues of growth, while people compete to buy into them, our knowledge institutions go begging." The reasons are clear. Knowledge institutions, such as our libraries, do not pay the kind of dividends that are reflected on the stock market. They are sometimes called philanthropic, which means that they profit nobody, except everybody, and that their dividends go to the whole community. These knowledge institutions—and especially our public libraries—ask charity, the community's small change, just to keep their heat and their lights on, and to keep their unrenovated doors open.

It is a cliché of our time that this Nation needs an "informed citizenry," by which we mean citizens who are up on the latest information—who have read this week's news magazine, today's newspaper, and watched the 7 o'clock news. Perhaps, as Dr. Boorstin suggests, what we need is a "knowledgeable citizenry" rather than an informed one. Information, like entertainment, is something someone else provides for us. We expect to be entertained, we also expect to be informed. We cannot be "knowledgeable." This we must do for ourselves. This is the task for which our libraries are uniquely equipped and something the computer can never do for us. Knowledge comes from "the free mind foraging in the rich pastures of the whole everywhere-past. It comes from finding order and meaning in the whole human experience." In short libraries are as essential in developing a knowledgeable citizenry, and they are more essential than ever in our current information age. ●

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and friend, Mr. SOLARZ from New York, is well known in this body as a forceful advocate for a new foreign policy. He recently spoke before the Democratic Platform Committee, of which I am a member. As always, Mr. SOLARZ has offered us an astute and insightful analysis of the choices which face us, and I am sure that his views will be highly valued by the other Members of this body. I ask that his statement be entered into the RECORD. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

In his 1980 debate with President Carter, Ronald Reagan asked the American people an important question: "Are you better off than you were four years ago?"

In 1984, the Democratic Party should be asking the American people a similar question: Is the world safer today, and is our country more secure, than it was four years ago?

Posed in these terms, the answer can only be an emphatic no.

In almost every corner of the globe, four years of Republican foreign policy have made the world a more dangerous place in which to live.

In Central America, where the Administration has sought military solutions to what are essentially political problems, its policies are leading us ineluctably toward the introduction of American combat forces into El Salvador, and possibly Nicaragua as well.

In the Middle East, the collapse of our policy in Lebanon, and the failure of the Administration to keep the peace process going, has led to a situation where the clock has begun ticking on another Arab-Israeli war, which could all too easily escalate into a superpower confrontation.

In Africa, by pandering to the racist regime in Pretoria, the Administration has turned a deaf ear to the cries of 20 million black South Africans who are denied their most basic human rights, and, in the process, has alienated virtually all of black Africa.

In Asia, we have compromised our long-term strategic interest in a cooperative relationship with the peoples of the region, by appearing to embrace repressive regimes in the Philippines, South Korea, and Pakistan.

In Europe, the very foundations of the NATO alliance have been shaken by the Administration's inflammatory, anti-Soviet rhetoric, and by its apparently greater interest in acquiring a nuclear war-fighting capability than in negotiating mutually beneficial arms control agreements.

But perhaps most disturbing of all, our relationship with the Soviet Union, upon which the future of our country and the world ultimately depends, has dangerously deteriorated.

In the face of a worsening international situation, much of which is attributable to the counterproductive policies of the Reagan Administration, the challenge that

confronts the Democratic Party is to write a realistic and responsible foreign policy platform which holds forth the hope of reducing the prospects for war and enhancing the possibilities for peace.

This requires a foreign policy which approaches the problems that confront us primarily in their national and regional contexts, rather than viewing them, as the Reagan Administration does, almost exclusively as a manifestation of the "evil empire's" efforts to extend its sway over the entire globe.

It requires a foreign policy which promotes the cause of human rights by opposing tyranny on the part of left and right wing governments, rather than a foreign policy, like the one we have now, which supports virtually every reactionary and repressive regime that professes to be anti-communist, while concentrating our criticism solely against the suppression of human rights by the Soviet Union and its communist allies.

And it also requires, above all else, a national security policy in which the use of force is a last resort, as preferred by most Americans, rather than a first resort, as preferred by the Reagan Administration.

Specifically, I believe that our platform should clearly call for the following major policy changes:

In Central America, we should affirm our support of genuine negotiations by wholeheartedly endorsing the Contadora process, which represents the last best chance for ending the escalating cycle of regional violence, and a halt to those U.S. policies, such as quasi-permanent military exercises in Honduras, which run counter to the spirit of the Contadora initiative.

We should also call for the termination of the effort to overthrow the established Government of Nicaragua by covert means, while also manifesting our disappointment over the betrayal of the democratic promises of the Nicaraguan revolution and our desire for the establishment of a genuine democracy in Nicaragua.

And we should make clear our determination to link strictly any additional aid to El Salvador to a cessation of the routine murder of innocent civilians by the Salvadoran security forces, and a willingness by the Government of El Salvador to enter into a good faith and unconditional dialogue with the opposition in an effort to end the war through a political settlement of the conflict.

In the Middle East, we should reaffirm our commitment to the Camp David peace process, which has been virtually ignored by the Reagan Administration, by calling on Egypt to return to the autonomy negotiations and live up to its obligations under the Camp David agreement by returning its Ambassador to Israel.

We should also make clear our intention to refrain from selling advanced American weaponry to those countries in the region that are not prepared to participate in the peace process.

In Asia, where our principles and interests would be best served by a greater respect for human rights, we should call for the restoration of democracy in the Philippines, the elimination of martial law on Taiwan, a return to freedom of speech and the press in South Korea, and the establishment of a popularly elected government in Pakistan. At the same time, we should also reaffirm our sympathy and support for the heroic efforts of the Afghan freedom fighters to secure the withdrawal of Soviet forces from their country, and for the efforts of the

decent and democratic Cambodian resistance movements, such as the K.P.N.L.F., to secure the withdrawal of Vietnamese forces from Cambodia.

In Africa, we should reject the Administration's rapprochement with racism, by making it unmistakably clear that we are opposed to the apartheid system and everything it stands for.

The choice that confronts us in South Africa is not, as the Administration has said, between black and white. It is a choice between justice and injustice, between right and wrong, between decency and indecency.

The Democratic Party should make clear that we intend to repudiate racism in South Africa, by deed as well as by word, through the establishment of effective sanctions against South Africa until such time as apartheid is abolished.

In Europe, we should call for policies designed to strengthen the alliance—the unity of which is a necessary condition for the preservation of peace.

To this end, we should propose initiatives to revive the INF and START talks, including the "Walk in the Woods" formula, as a way of convincingly demonstrating to our European allies our genuine commitment to meaningful arms control agreements.

Last, but not least, we must give high priority to repairing our relationship with the Soviet Union.

While continuing to make those improvements in our own forces, both conventional and strategic, which are necessary in order to enhance deterrence, we should also make it clear to the Soviet Union that we are willing to end the madness of a never-ending arms race by negotiating mutually beneficial arms control agreements. Here we should call for the immediate establishment of a mutual and verifiable nuclear arms freeze, the ratification of the already signed SALT II, threshold test ban and peaceful nuclear explosion treaties, and the prompt resumption of negotiations for a comprehensive test ban treaty.

In order to facilitate a rapid breakthrough in the arms control negotiations, and to set the stage for a general reduction in tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union, we should indicate that a Democratic President will seek a U.S.-Soviet summit meeting during the first year of his Administration, and annually thereafter.

In the context of the improvement in U.S.-Soviet relations, which such an approach would make possible, we should make it clear that we fully intend to use our influence on behalf of the cause of human rights in the Soviet Union in general, and of the right of Soviet Jews to emigrate from the Soviet Union in particular.

A foreign policy plank based on these principles and proposals would constitute a blueprint for the kind of progress toward a more peaceful world to which the Democratic Party, if it is going to win the coming election, must clearly and convincingly commit itself in its platform. ●

ARMS CONTROL AND THE DEFENSE BUDGET

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, the issues of defense spending and nation-

al security are prominent concerns of a great many of us in Congress. We are faced with unprecedented increases in military expenditures and questionable assertions by the administration that our national security is being strengthened correspondingly. Certainly, many experts have made noteworthy and valuable proposals and evaluations of the defense budget. Recently, the Wall Street Journal carried an article by Adm. Noel Gayler in which the admiral contributes a lucid analysis of military weapons programs and their relationship to our national security. I insert the article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and urge my colleagues to read it:

OK, MR. PRESIDENT, HERE ARE SOME BIG
MILITARY CUTS

(By Noel Gayler)

President Reagan has directly challenged the Democrats to "... say what they would eliminate in the Defense budget, and how much money that would then save, and we could study and see what that would do to our national security." This is a most welcome approach, far preferable to Caspar Weinberger's "Christmas tree" budget and subsequent stonewalling. The president seems to suggest that we can, in fact, evaluate defense monies the sensible way: See what it is we have to be able to do, then procure and support the means required to do it.

The good news is that we can cut the defense budget significantly and improve our security—both, at the same time. With mirrors? No. By more rhetoric about "Pentagon waste, fraud and abuse"? No. The Pentagon is, to its credit, once more taking vigorous action in this area, and the really big bucks are not there anyway. By "trimming the fat"—cuts across the board? No. This is a popular way to avoid decisions and responsibility. To cut across the board results in programs that are late and unnecessarily expensive, in troops untrained, in supplies neglected, in morale shattered by neglect of people.

The immediate way to cut defense and improve our security is to cut off the useless, dangerous and inordinately expensive new nuclear-weapons programs—root and branch. Not many people realize that we have no fewer than nine new nuclear-weapon programs—with strategic capabilities currently in development or early production. What are they? Three kinds of cruise missiles (ground-launched, sea-launched, air-launched); two kinds of strategic bombers (B-1 and Stealth); two kinds of intercontinental ballistic missiles (MX and Midgetman); a new submarine-launched missile, plus submarines (Trident II); plus Pershing II, Nine. We won't have a Triad—we'll have everything but the kitchen sink.

Like all major programs, these programs start off comparatively small and grow year by year to maximum demand for money. Since they are all developing in roughly the same time period, they will inevitably collide for funds. Two courses will then remain: Cancel some programs, or stretch them all out. Far better we should cancel now. There are much more compelling reasons to get rid of or cut back these dangerous and destabilizing weapons, but the financial reasons are good enough.

We are talking about savings of many, many billions of dollars. How many is

almost impossible to estimate. Not only are the official figures for programs such as MX and B-1 suspect, in the light of history, but other programs, such as Midgetman, are yet to be defined. Costs for dual-purpose system such as bombers and cruise missiles are difficult to allocate rationally and many supporting costs are swept under the rug. But a total savings of \$200 billion over five years from dropping these new strategic nuclear systems seems not unreasonable.

There are, in addition, enormous costs for so-called tactical nuclear systems such as neutron weapons, anti-aircraft weapons, anti-submarine weapons and anti-ballistic missile warheads. These programs, of varying vagueness, have in common a voracious appetite for money and a total absence of rationale.

For example, for the Navy to start a nuclear war at sea by using nuclear depth charges against submarines would be an act of supreme folly. The Soviets would surely retaliate. But we are the side that depends on big ships, both naval and commercial. One nuclear weapon destroys one ship, whatever its size. In addition, subsurface detonation of a nuclear weapon would blank out sound detection in entire areas of ocean. Nuclear anti-aircraft missiles, if used, would blind all friendly fighter pilots in the air. As one who was a fighter pilot for many years, I am sure that pilots would be quite unwilling to fly in that environment. Never mind arm-waving about identifying friend from foe. Those of us who have been shot at by "friendly" forces know just how reliable that is!

The list of misguided nuclear programs seems endless: "advanced" cruise missiles, "advanced" air-to-surface missiles, anti-submarine warfare standoff weapons, a new "tactical" bomb.

These inexplicable programs seem to stem less from ideology and even mistaken military analysis than from technological push: If it can be built, build it. The high security classification accorded most nuclear-weapons programs has served to keep the relevant staff working in the hands of a small and self-perpetuating group, a sort of nuclear mafia. Common-sense concerns about the boomerang consequences of these weapons get short shrift.

So there we have it. Nine new strategic nuclear-weapons systems, and an unknown but large number of new "tactical" nuclear developments. Seventeen thousand new nuclear warheads programmed, plus new production facilities for nuclear weapons material. Total program savings for strategic and tactical weapons—were they to be eliminated—from \$225 billion to something much larger.

Then we have Star Wars. This invocation of the mystic capabilities of "science" to protect us all proposes to put together untried technologies of extraordinary difficulty—at a scale never attempted—to be launched into space and somehow protected. The eventual systems cost is of the same order of magnitude as the gross national product. Effective countermeasures are comparatively simple, obvious and cheap. Chance of protecting populations: nil. There is, of course, no prospect whatever that we will fund and build any Star Wars system. There is, however, a very good chance that we will divert very considerable funds into research and attempted development. The proper place for these ideas lies in research at the level of computer and proof-of-principle experiment. Extravagant expenditure is totally unjustified.

What would be the effect on our security were we to drop or truncate the new nuclear-weapons systems? There would be no loss of deterrence: We would still have the capability to devastate the U.S.S.R., even after being attacked. The TRIAD would still be in place, any leg alone could do the job many times over. Certainly we must bargain with the Soviets for equal restraint, but there would be no loss of bargaining power, for the Soviets will feel no need to match programs we do not adopt. And there will be major military gains in focussing command attention and resources on our real military needs rather than on unusable weapons, or even magic.

There are, of course, other ways to scrutinize defense. None has such clear-cut advantages, so little risk and such obvious improvements to our security as eliminating new nuclear-weapons development. The immediate savings are large. The potential savings are tremendous. The reduction in the risk of nuclear war is beyond price.

TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR MIKE RODRIGUEZ

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on April 28 I will have the distinct honor of attending a testimonial dinner recognizing a fine public servant who has been an important community leader in my home city of Newark, Miguel "Mike" Rodriguez.

Mike has been a top adviser to Newark's Mayor Kenneth Gibson since 1974. His record of community activities is extensive—he was appointed to the board of the Essex County Recreation and Parks Commission and serves as an officer of the United Community Corporation and the mayor's office of employment and training. His political accomplishments are equally impressive—founder of the Essex County Political Forum, founder and first president of the Newark Borinquen Lions Club, and first president of the Hispanic Democratic Committee for the State of New Jersey.

The dinner, which will be held at the Quality Inn in Newark, is an opportunity for those of us who know Mike to show our appreciation and gratitude. It is also an occasion to raise funds for one of his personal charities—the Mike Rodriguez Baseball Little League. Mike organized the league in 1980 to give inner-city children recreational and athletic opportunities.

Mike Rodriguez is the kind of public servant who gives his community a great deal of himself. I am very pleased that the testimonial dinner will allow us to let him know how highly we regard him. I salute Mike Rodriguez for his dedication, his spirit, and his commitment to making our community a better place to live.

90 YEARS OF PROCLAIMING AND SERVING

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the history and valuable contributions of the Baptist Ministers' Conference of Philadelphia and Vicinity, which will be celebrating its 90th anniversary this year.

HISTORY OF THE BAPTIST MINISTERS' CONFERENCE OF PHILADELPHIA AND VICINITY, 1894-1984

90 YEARS OF PROCLAIMING AND SERVING

In the year of Our Lord Eighteen Hundred Ninety-four, the Black Baptist population of the Delaware Valley numbered over One Hundred Thousand families. The City of Brotherly Love, during this period in history, was embarking upon social change and radical reform. Spiritual leaders within the Black Community saw the need for an evangelical Baptist organization that would serve as the voice and conscience of their denominational community. On the twelve day of April in the year 1894, thirteen Baptist Ministers met at the home of the Reverend E. E. Skinner, 19th and Fitzwater Streets and there organized the Baptist Ministers' Conference of Philadelphia and Vicinity. These thirteen founding fathers, all of whom are deceased were, The Reverends: J. Barksdale, Pastor, Union Baptist Church, Theodore Miller, Pastor, First African Baptist Church, George Blakewell, Pastor, New Central Baptist Church, R. W. Goff, Pastor, White Rock Baptist Church, J. C. King, Pastor, Second Baptist Church of Frankford, E. W. Johnson, Pastor, St. Paul Baptist Church, A. C. Skinner, John J. Clinton, H. S. Saunders and the Reverends Wakefield, Johnigan and Crump. These ecclesiastical heirs ascribed to the distinct principal that Baptist acknowledged no human founder, insisted on personal experience in religion, complete freedom and independence in civil matters, while possessing full autonomy on the basis of individual equality in local churches.

For the first three years, the conference was hosted by various churches and met in numerous private homes. The rapid growth of the membership mandated a viable meeting place, and in 1897, the Shiloh Baptist Church became Conference Headquarters, then pastored by the Reverend William H. Phillips. Since that time several Philadelphia Baptist churches have held the distinction of being Conference Headquarters, the present one being, the Mt. Sinai Tabernacle Baptist Church, pastored by the Reverend Joseph Fuller, Jr. After the turn of the century and during the pioneering teens, the terrifying twenties, the trying thirties, the war torn forties, the segregated fifties, the social changing sixties, the sophisticated seventies, and into the visionary eighties, this illustrious coalition of theocratic expositors has proclaimed the Good News of the Gospel and has served as spiritual leaders in the face of difficulties and persecutions. Since its inception, to the present, the influence of the Baptist Minister's Conference has grown to nationwide prominence. Heads of States and Statesmen have continuously sought and requested an audience

before this august body. This conference assumed a leadership roll in selective patronage, voter registration and has brought about community awareness in areas of educational, political and social change, yet ever proclaiming that Jesus Christ is Lord. This conference has supported colleges, Universities, Camp sites, the N.A.A.C.P., Push, while still mindful and responsive to needs of individuals and sister churches in times of a crisis. Its yearly financial contributions to worthy causes total thousands of dollars. Many Sons of this conference now pastor some of our Nations leading Baptist Congregations. The membership roll consists of over 200 Baptist Ministers, some of whom are Elected Politicians, Lawyers, Businessmen, Authors, Professors, Journalists and sought after eloquent Pulpiters. The Baptist Ministers' Conference of Philadelphia and vicinity is affectionately dubbed "The Greatest Conference in the World". Still after Ninety Years of existence, it doeth not yet appear what we shall be. We bless the memory of past leaders whose foundations we yet build upon. Through the years we have been constantly reminded that we have a Charge to Keep and a God to Glorify. Our glorious weekly fellowship meetings bears witness to the fact that we love the Brotherhood and we are one in the spirit.

Faith of Our Conference,
Christian Faith,
In truth beyond all man made creeds
We love the Lord and serve the Church
And breathe thy Spirit through Our deeds,
Faith of Our Conference,
Christian Faith,
We will be true to thee 'til death.

TRIBUTE TO DR. EDWARD J.
MUEHLHAUSEN, DISTIN-
GUISHED EDUCATOR

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a good education is the greatest gift which we can give to the next generation of Americans. And the people who make that gift possible are the dedicated educators of our country. Among those, none can figure more prominently than Dr. Edward J. Muehlhausen of my district. For almost 30 years he has given himself selflessly to the community, and has helped make the schools in my district among the finest in the Nation.

In the ever-changing world of education Ed has proved both an innovative leader and a stabilizing force in the community. He led a drive to construct three new schools, while developing exemplary programs in library services, remedial assistance, special education and gifted schemes. Another of his pioneering ideas was the integration of handicapped students into regular schools—a policy now adopted nationwide. Ed also fostered outstanding community relations between parents, teachers and the school administration.

It has been my great privilege to have worked personally with Dr. Muehlhausen, first as member of the Millbrae School Board and now as a Member of Congress. He has been a tireless public servant whose commitment and devotion to higher standards of education have earned him the respect and admiration of all who have worked with him.

On the occasion of his retirement, I have great pleasure in joining with his family, friends and colleagues to salute his many achievements. He has shown by his example that the important lesson to better schools for our children is paved by the dedicated, steady leadership of our educators.●

SUPPORT URGED FOR MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS IN SYRIA

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, on April 5, I submitted a letter which the American Bar Association had initiated regarding the persecution of lawyers in Iran. I believe that the work professional organizations have been doing in the field of international human rights is exemplary, and should be publicly congratulated. I would like to bring to the attention of this body a notice which appeared in the New England Journal of Medicine alerting readers to the persecution of doctors in Syria. I think that organizing people along occupational lines in defense of the rights of their colleagues in other countries is a very effective method of advocacy and one of the many signs of the continued vigor of the international human rights movement. I would like to commend the Journal for bringing this matter before the medical world, and I ask that the article be reprinted in the RECORD.

[From the New England Journal of Medicine, Mar. 22, 1984]

SUPPORT URGED FOR SYRIAN DOCTORS

Medical professionals in Syria have stood up in defense of human rights in their country, and for that stand, many have been arrested. Today the whereabouts of many of those doctors remain unknown. This alarming news is documented in a recent Amnesty International report on the situation of human rights in Syria.

According to the report, Syrian security forces in 1980 arrested, without charge or trial, 101 physicians, dentists, and veterinarians. The detentions followed a one-day strike on March 31, 1980, by three professional groups—doctors, lawyers, and engineers—to protest the lack of government response to their requests for legislative reforms. The three professional groups sought the lifting of the state of emergency that had been in effect in Syria since March 8, 1963, which had resulted in widespread arbitrary arrests, incommunicado detention,

"disappearances," and torture. Shortly after the strike, on April 9, the Syrian Ministerial Cabinet dissolved the national congresses and regional assemblies of all three professional groups. In the weeks that followed, scores of doctors, lawyers, and engineers were jailed, including 90 physicians, 5 dentists, and 6 veterinary surgeons.

Amnesty International has recorded the names of 3,500 persons who were allegedly jailed by the security forces between January 1980 and December 1981 alone. The prisoners allegedly were kept incommunicado, often in solitary confinement for periods of a few days to years, without access to defense counsel or family, and without medical examinations or care.

One example is Dr. Tawfiq Drak al-Siba'i, a neurologist and the father of five young children, who was detained in May 1980. He had been summoned to the office of the director of prisons in his native town of Homs after Syrian censors intercepted a letter sent to him from relatives in Saudi Arabia. On June 2, only a week after his arrest, the prison authorities in Homs denied any knowledge of Dr. Siba'i's whereabouts. His case has been brought before the United Nations Working Group on Enforced or Voluntary Disappearances.

Amnesty International claims that detainees are often subjected to torture while in official custody. The organization has been unable to secure medical examinations to verify claims of torture on all former detainees who have left the country, but in cases in which examinations were made by Amnesty doctors, the results confirmed allegations of abuse.

Testimony included complaints of torture of both a physical and psychological nature. A total of 23 different kinds of torture have been described—among them, beatings with steel cables, belts, or whips, electric shock, extraction of finger nails, soaking the victim with extremely hot or cold water, and sexual abuse. Psychological methods range from sleep deprivation to threats of amputation or execution. Some detainees have reportedly been forced to witness the torture of sexual abuse of friends and relatives.

The imprisoned doctors represent a wide spectrum of the Syrian medical profession. They include general practitioners, such as Dr. Sa'id Zaidan from Idlib and Dr. Usama 'Urfall from Latakia, and surgeons like Dr. Mustafa 'Uthman from Tartus, as well as gynecologists, pediatricians, and academic professors of surgery, neurology, dermatology, and urology. Despite repeated efforts, Amnesty International has been unable to obtain further information on the status of these doctors since their arrest in 1980. And there is grave concern that many are still in detention without charge or trial.

On April 26, 1983, Amnesty International submitted to Syrian President Hafaz al-Assad a memorandum with a detailed list of doctors and others reportedly in detention or whose whereabouts were unknown. The organization expressed the hope that constructive discussions on human rights could be held with the Syrian government. But, since the Syrians failed to reply to the inquiry, Amnesty International published the memorandum in November 1983 to call public attention to the problem.

We bring this information to the attention of our colleagues not because we believe a physician's life is intrinsically of greater worth than that of another person, but because we share with our Syrian col-

leagues professional knowledge, goals, and ethical standards, as well as a community of spirit. Our pressure on behalf of our colleagues is likely to prove more effective than pressure from others. Physicians are held in high esteem in their communities, and acts against them are deterrents to political dissent by others.

There are several ways in which health professionals can assist foreign colleagues in serious trouble. They can, as individuals or through their professional associations, send appeals to government officials in offending countries and raise these concerns with the U.S. government. Medical groups can arrange for publicity about these cases in their society journals and newsletters. There are health and scientific associations in this country that are already speaking out in defense of the basic human rights of their foreign colleagues, such as the National Academy of Sciences, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and several other major health and medical groups. For instance, the American Medical Association (AMA) resolved in 1983:

"That the AMA express to the United States Congress and to appropriate international organizations its concern about the disappearance of physicians, medical students, and other health care professionals with resulting inadequate care to the sick and injured of countries in turmoil."

We believe that the current plight of Syrian doctors deserves serious attention by health professionals and their associations.

Pressure from colleagues has been effective in the past. Dr. Juan Jose Hurtado, a Guatemalan medical anthropologist, was detained by authorities in his country in June 1982 and subsequently released and allowed to emigrate. This followed a mission of inquiry by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences, the American Public Health Association, and other scientific groups, which received wide publicity in the Guatemalan press.

The problem of persecution of our colleagues is assuming alarming proportions in several countries; the repression of Syrian doctors is only one example. Collegial support from around the world often deters governments from engaging in illegal arrest, torture, or even murder, and may assist in securing the release of detainees. Publicity is a particularly effective weapon. Experience has shown that the strength of a collective international voice does make a difference. The Syrian medical community is no longer able to speak out in defense of freedom for its colleagues. The responsibility lies with us.

Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, D.C.

Amnesty International U.S.A. Washington, D.C.

ELENA O. NIGHTINGALE,
M.D., Ph.D.
ERIC STOVER.
DAVID A. FLOCKHART, Ph.D.
CURT GOERING.●

HONDURAN ARMED FORCES RENEW THEIR DEMOCRATIC COMMITMENT

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the new Chief of the Honduran Armed Forces, Brig. Gen. Walter Lopez Reyes, issued a statement in which he reaffirmed the apolitical nature of the armed forces and their commitment and subservience to elected civilian authorities. This statement is very reassuring to those of us in the Congress who have been concerned that, with support of the Reagan administration, the Honduran Armed Forces were eclipsing the civilian government. I include a translation of the statement in the RECORD, and I urge the administration to be strong and forthright in its support of this constitutional role for the Honduran Armed Forces.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY THE CHIEF OF THE ARMED FORCES, BRIG. GEN. WALTER LOPEZ REYES

Fellow citizens: The Armed Forces of Honduras, in view of recent events occurring in the same, feel it appropriate and consider it their duty to inform the Honduran people and the international community of the principles, laws, obligations and duties that govern their operation as a permanent institution of the State.

The Constitution of the Republic establishes that the Armed Forces of Honduras are a national institution of a permanent nature, essentially professional, apolitical, obedient, and nondeliberative. It clearly and concretely sets its purposes as such: "It is instituted to defend the territorial integrity and the sovereignty of the Republic, maintain the peace, public order and rule of the Constitution, the principles of free suffrage and the alternation in the exercise of the presidency of the Republic."

In addition, the constitutive law of the Armed Forces regulates in a specific manner the administration, operation and hierarchy necessary to make effective those purposes within the general framework of the principles established in the Constitution of the Republic.

The operation of our armed institution does not consist of making attempts against the legally constituted powers, but rather on the contrary, of defending our system of republican, democratic and representative government.

With full conviction we state that the practice of assuming functions that are constitutionally reserved for others who the people elect freely in use of their sovereign rights, is behind us, like a by-gone era.

We reiterate our full subordination to the legal institutionality of the State. Our responsibility is to be vigilant with respect to its preservation and consolidation.

For us these principles are indisputable, both because they have the category of established norm and because they respond to the doctrinal principle of a way of living that our people have found, discussed and accepted as the best, in their struggle for

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

freedom, order, equality, peace and progress.

In addition, we understand that the purposes that the constitution reserves to us, the Armed Forces, constitute the noblest obligation towards the motherland, but that they also demand the highest sense of duty and sacrifice. It is for that reason that we understand that ours must be an institution of exceptional conditions, qualities, and characteristics in an ethical, moral, civic, and professional sense, in order to be able to carry out such noble but difficult responsibilities.

We want to make it clear that we understand the constitutional principles of political non-involvement, professionalism, obedience and non-deliberation, not as empty or routine legal expressions but rather as the most serious for generating the normality of a harmonic, peaceful, tranquil, safe and permanent society. We officers who make up the Armed Forces believe in this concept with our own conviction, based on our professional training, and in adherence to the moral, ethical, and civic values that are guaranteed in the conduct of the good soldier.

We reiterate our position before the Honduran people, that the chiefs and officers of the Armed Forces believe that a behavior of loyalty, honesty and morality that projects a dignified image of confident soldiers in the service of the motherland, which is a reason for pride within the borders and for international respect, is necessary and fundamental.

The professional training of those of us who currently make up our armed institution guarantees that behavior. Therefore, the people and the different sectors that make up the nation must have confidence and credibility in the Armed Forces, their best ally for reaching the common goals that we propose for the benefit of each and every Honduran.

The events to which we have referred and that have attracted the attention of the citizenry, have been no more than actions within those principles and concepts that establish our condition as soldiers aware of our duties and obligations under the law, and within the principle of hierarchy, our respect for the other institutions of the state and its administrative jurisdictions.

We want to make it clear so that it will be understood once and for all by all, that we consider the Armed Forces an institution that forms part of a constitutional unitary government, which, in accordance with the norms of the Constitution of the Republic and the powers it sets for it, follows the direction and orientation from its hierarchical superiors and is committed to keeping that Constitution in force within the legal framework, but never outside of or above it.

We want to be viewed in that dimension and perspective, because within that context we are trained and will continue training without detours in order to guarantee the permanence of our institution, which is and should continue to be the school where the soldier learns his profession and later gives it its service in order to maintain the integrity and democratic existence of the motherland. A school where also moralistic leaders are forged, not simple presumptuous ones who dogmatically exhort the other to be good.

Let the speculation over the purposes that have motivated our actions not be used to distort a highly patriotic action that exalts the constitutional government. And with the President of the Republic and under his

April 24, 1984

authorization and guidance, in his role as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, we have made this decision for the good of the nation and its democratic institutions threatened outside our borders by exotic doctrines contrary to the idiosyncrasy of the Honduran people.

The Honduran people, in the search for solutions to their large political, economic, and social problems, need men who cannot be bought or sold, men who are sincere and honorable in the depths of their souls, men who are not afraid to call things the way they see them, men whose conscience is as loyal to duty as the compass is to the pole, men who remain on the side of justice, even if the skies fall in.

(Tegucigalpa, April 5, 1984. Translated by Deanna Hammond, CRS Language Services.)

PLIGHT OF YURIY
SHUKHEVYCH

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, as a nation committed to human rights, I would like to draw my colleagues attention to the plight of Yuriy Shukhevych. Branded as an anti-Soviet agitator, Mr. Shukhevych was imprisoned because of his refusal to denounce his father who fought the Russian occupation of Ukraine 40 years ago. The unjust and inhumane treatment which Mr. Shukhevych was forced to suffer has subsequently resulted in a severe deterioration of his health. Although he was released from prison in 1982, he is now serving a 5-year sentence of internal exile in the Soviet Union.

I would like to include in the RECORD a resolution concerning Yuriy Shukhevych which was adopted by the Council of the City of Philadelphia.

RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
PHILADELPHIA

Expressing concern for the inhumane treatment of Yuriy Shukhevych in Soviet prisons, and memorializing the President of the United States, the United States Congress, and the Department of State to use every means available to obtain his release.

Whereas basic human rights and fundamental freedoms have long been recognized as having valid universal significance and are currently a subject of pressing international concern; and,

Whereas these basic rights are spelled out in the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; and

Whereas the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe has given a new dimension to the humanitarian principles these covenants embody by reaffirming each state-signatory's right to be concerned with the manner in which human rights and fundamental freedoms are respected and implemented by all other signatories; and,

Whereas the President of the United States has expressed his deep concern and

commitment to human rights in the world; and,

Whereas Yuriy Shukhevych has been incarcerated in Soviet prisons for almost thirty years merely for his refusal to denounce his father who, as Commander-in-Chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, fought the occupation of Ukraine; and,

Whereas, the harsh treatment and severe sentence of Yuriy Shukhevych reaffirms that a system of repression exists in the Soviet Union and this fact greatly concerns the people of the United States; therefore,

Resolved, by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby express concern for the inhumane treatment and long sentence in Soviet prisons of Yuriy Shukhevych, and memorialize the president of the United States, the United States Congress, and the Department of State to use every means available to obtain the release of Yuriy Shukhevych from imprisonment and request that an exit visa for him and his family be granted.

Resolved, That an Engrossed copy of this Resolution be presented to William Nezowy, Vice Chairman of External Affairs of the Philadelphia Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, and certified copies be sent to Ronald Reagan, President of the United States, to George P. Shultz, Secretary of State, and to members of the United States Congress.

Certification: This is a true and correct copy of the original Resolution adopted by the council of the City of Philadelphia on the twenty-second day of September, 1983.

Attest:

JOSEPH E. COLEMAN,
President of City Council.
CHARLES H. SAUVER, Jr.,
Chief Clerk of the Council.

BRONZE SHIELDS' 25TH YEAR OF SERVICE

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am very honored to be among those who will attend a memorial service on Sunday, April 29, to commemorate the 25th year of the Bronze Shields, one of Newark's finest fraternal organizations.

The Bronze Shields is an organization of black police officers which was established in the late 1950's and has served the community with distinction for 25 years. It was initially founded as a response to exclusion of black officers from other ethnic police organizations. The Bronze Shields received a charter establishing it as a nonprofit organization in 1959 and since then it has played a leading role in civic activities. The group has donated thousands of dollars to worthy causes and needy families throughout the Newark community.

The memorial service will be held at the Metropolitan Baptist Church in Newark. In addition to the members of the Bronze Shields, their families and friends, the service will be attended by Police Director Hubert Williams and

the Honorable Kenneth Gibson, mayor of Newark. The program includes a choral selection by members of the organization, a history of the Bronze Shields by Detective James DuBose, and a sermon on "What Memorial Means to a Christian" by Sgt. John Reed. After the sermon, a roll-call of departed members will be read, giving the names of those we remember at this memorial service; 3 of the 30 deceased members died in the line of duty: Leslie Haskins, Arthur Williams, and John Laury. In addition, we will remember Deputy Chief Edward Williams, George Friday, Leroy Glover, Theodore Howard, William Stewart, Gary Spaugh, William Jennings, James Simpson, Carl Spruill, Jessie Stewart, Martin Ashby, Jr., Carl E. Gregory, Andrew Garner, John L. Hunt, Henry Johnson, Floyd Kee, Homer Mosley, Sr., Samuel Terry, William Wheeler, Leroy Oliver, Robert Millard, Theodore Hanaze, Charles Dennis, Tommie Williams, Richard Stevenson, Oscar Perry, and William Duff.

Mr. Speaker, I have the highest regard for this organization which has served our community so well. There are many individual officers affiliated with the Bronze Shields, all of whom are a credit to our police force and community, and there is not adequate time to name them all. I do, however, wish to commend the president of the Bronze Shields, Mose Alexander; Vice President Leonard McGhee; and the cochairmen of the memorial day committee, Joseph Foushee and James DuBose.●

PRISON CONDITIONS IN POLAND SHAMEFUL

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of all Members an article which appeared in the Washington Post on Saturday, April 21. The article describes a survey of the health conditions of political prisoners in Poland.

On April 11 former Ambassador to Poland Richard Davies and Ewa Bierezin, a recent emigre and former Solidarity member, addressed the question of treatment of Polish political prisoners at a special meeting of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus. Mrs. Bierezin spoke of the harsh treatment accorded political prisoners, including the lack of proper medicine and inability to correspond with friends and family.

The Post's article confirms that this tragic condition continues in Polish prisons today. Of special interest is the description of the treatment of

the seven leading members of Solidarity and four members of KOR (Social Self-Defense Committee). Some 80 Members of the House cosigned a letter on March 12 to Polish Premier Jaruzelski, appealing in behalf of these 11 men. Four of these eleven are suffering severe illnesses in prison, from gastric ulcers to heart disease.

This shameful treatment of political prisoners deserves our attention:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 21, 1984]

SURVEY FINDS POLISH DETAINEES AILING FOLLOWING CONFINEMENT

(By Bradley Graham)

WARSAW.—A detailed unofficial report on the health of a broad sample of Poles who were interned or jailed in the past two years for political offenses asserts that hundreds suffered lasting injuries stemming from harsh prison conditions.

The study, compiled by an underground medical team of about 10 doctors, alleges hundreds of cases of infection, ulcers, nervous disorders, heart problems, bone disease and other ailments among groups of released and still-jailed political dissidents, many of whom reportedly were subjected to mistreatment in internment centers and prisons.

No willful denial of proper medical care to prisoners is alleged. Rather, the point of the paper, summarized in an interview with one of its authors, is that medical treatment in Polish jails is atrociously substandard and Polish authorities have been insensitive to the serious health damage being done to inmates.

Publication of the report coincides with a drive by former prisoners to secure special legal status and improved treatment for Poles incarcerated for political crimes.

At a service Sunday in the Roman Catholic Carmelite Church in Warsaw, hundreds of sympathizers added their names to the 15 signers of an appeal to parliament for a law to regulate "the treatment of prisoners of conscience." The statement called on the government to guarantee political prisoners the right to have books, wear civilian clothes, enjoy unrestricted correspondence, live in unlocked cells and receive more frequent visits from relatives, as well as be given proper medical care.

The protest campaign comes amid a sharp crackdown on opposition activity that has placed 200 more Poles behind bars, doubling the number of political prisoners since January, according to the government's count.

Inmates in at least four prisons have gone on hunger strikes recently to dramatize the plight of political prisoners. At present, according to government spokesman Jerzy Urban, three prisoners at the penitentiary in Barczewo and 10 at Braniewo are refusing meals in a demand for greater privileges.

Rebuking Communist authorities for ill-treatment of political opponents, Poland's Roman Catholic primate, Cardinal Jozef Glemp, said in an Easter message this week that "much suffering is being inflicted in such institutions as the prisons." He added: "It is impermissible to inflict suffering on anyone or on oneself without obvious reason."

Government officials have insisted that proper care has been provided to political prisoners under martial law and since. Asked at a news conference Tuesday about authorizing special status for political inmates, Urban replied that prison regulations

already grant them some special rights, including separation from criminal offenders and exemption from work duty. Additionally, wardens are empowered to extend other privileges in individual cases.

Urban said a general reform of prison regulations is being prepared, but no change in the status of persons sentenced for political crimes is planned.

In their letter to parliament, the former prisoners who were the initial signers—among them Klemens Szaniawski, a logician, Zofia Romaszewska, a physicist, and Maciej Jankowski, a welder and former Solidarity national commission member—complained that privileges previously allowed political prisoners were withdrawn in December and harassment was stepped up afterward.

"We are convinced," the appeal said, "that regulation of this issue by nothing short of a parliamentary law would have great moral significance. The idea that political goals or ideology can be attained by the illtreatment of prisoners, by exacting revenge on defenseless people, should be only too terrifying to all."

"The replacement of all the tenets of political ethics by brutality and revenge begets blind terror which, as we know from recent history, hurts both the victors and the vanquished."

The health study, prepared by an opposition group set up in February called the Social Health Commission, is based on medical examinations of 988 people interned for up to a year following the crushing of the Solidarity independent trade union in December 1981, and another 348 people who served up to 30 months in jail on political convictions.

These examinations were conducted by physicians during the past two years at hospitals or outpatient clinics, mostly in Warsaw but also in Krakow, Gdansk and Wrocław.

The study, a copy of which was made available to The Washington Post, is to be published in an inaugural issue of a clandestine Bulletin of Independent Medical Thought. An earlier version reporting only the findings on people interned under martial law appeared in last October's issue of the Paris-based Polish-language journal *Kultura*.

The practice of internment, during which more than 10,000 people were said by unofficial sources to have been held in isolation centers without formal charges, ended in December 1982. Hundreds of others who were sentenced or held in jail on political charges were freed under an amnesty last July at the formal lifting of martial law.

To put the medical report's conclusions in perspective, it should be noted that health care in Poland generally, in or out of prison, is notoriously poor.

"According to available information," the underground paper states, "many political prisoners currently serving sentences and those held in prisons in investigative detention pending trial suffer from various diseases. In Polish penitentiaries there is absolutely no possibility for systematic treatment of chronic forms of disease or for any forms of physical rehabilitation."

"Diagnostic procedure is attempted only sporadically, if at all. Acute, critical illnesses are either handled in prison hospital wards or in hospitals run by the Ministry of Internal Affairs."

"Incarcerated patients suffering from acute illnesses which pose a danger to life," the study goes on, "are as a rule kept on in-

correct and nonsystematic treatment within prisons. Cases are known of medicines, including antibiotics, being dispensed in diluted form only once a day, often omitting holidays."

According to information filtered through relatives and defense counsels, the states of health of the most celebrated group of political inmates—the seven Solidarity national commission members and the four officials of KOR, the former Social Self-Defense Committee—are said to vary. These leading dissidents are in their third year in prison, awaiting trials on charges of trying to overthrow the state.

Andrzej Gwiazda, the former vice chairman of Solidarity and a rival of Lech Walesa for the top job, has gastric ulcers and a long record of heart trouble and has lost most of his teeth. Seweryn Jaworski has gastric ulcers that have been treated by various drugs "without proper medical supervision," according to the report.

Marian Jurczyk reportedly has stomach and back problems as well as a gravely deteriorated heart condition. He was admitted this week to the cardiac intensive care unit of a suburban Warsaw hospital.

The other four Solidarity officials—Karol Modzelewski, Grzegorz Pałka, Andrzej Rozpłochowski and Jan Rulewski—are reported by doctors who participated in the study to be in fair to good condition.

Of the KOR leaders, Jacek Kuron, who overcame kidney stones last year, has coronary disease and hypertension but is reported in fair condition. Adam Michnik, Zbigniew Romaszewski and Henryk Wujec are said to be in relatively good shape.

The report said interviews with 350 freed political prisoners produced these findings:

Only 52, or 15 percent, reported no health problems.

A majority had suffered food poisoning at least once, and some many times.

About 80 percent suffered from diseased gums.

More than 60 percent complained of stomach or intestinal trouble. Doctors documented duodenal or gastric ulcers in 60 former inmates and said that jail terms had "greatly deteriorated" ulcer symptoms in "many persons."

25 percent had heart disease or hypertension. In 13 cases, these problems were said to have begun during confinement. Many complained of headaches and of persisting spells of weakness and dizziness.

85 percent suffered from mycosis (parasitic fungus), which doctors blamed on poor prison hygiene.

New or aggravated pains in bones and joints were found in more than 75 percent of those examined, a result of a lack of movement in jail or damp, cold cells.

Kidney ailments were found among 10 percent.

Neurotic disorders affected more than 50 percent.

A separate section of the report covering the health of people who had been interned found them suffering from similar afflictions.

"It can be established beyond doubt," the study concludes, "that the internment period left a decisive and unfavorable influence on their health condition."

"Among more than 60 percent of the internees in the examined sample there were found significant disturbances impairing to a large extent the patients' physical or mental fitness. The most frequent diseases or disorders were gastric ulcers, diseases of joints and muscles, hypertension, mental

disturbances and effects of physical violence.

"A large proportion of those people require continued medical assistance. . . . The health problems in that group of people are of a chronic nature, causing periodic unfitness for work and maladjustment to the routine hardships of life in this country."

"The medical profession ought to give these people every possible care and watch closely for pathological symptoms, bearing in mind that some of these people continue to be subjected to repression and are under constant threat of arrest." ●

HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL DAY

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

REMARKS AT SIMON WIESENTHAL CENTER ON THE OCCASION OF YOM HASHOAH AND IN TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM PERL

Sunday, April 29, communities throughout the world will gather to commemorate Holocaust Memorial Day—Yom Hashoah. On that day, we will join in sharing the painful memories of the Holocaust and in paying tribute to the more than six million innocent lives that perished. We will also join in sharing the survival of all those who escaped the death sentence of the Holocaust and the survival of a people the Nazis sought to annihilate.

Yom Hashoah is an occasion marked by both solemnity and hope—solemnity, because it is a reminder of one of the most heinous and horrific eras in the history of humankind; and hope, because it is a reaffirmation of the lives of all those who survived and all those who are yet to come.

The lessons of the Holocaust must be taught from generation to generation so that humanity will never forget those dark days of less than fifty years ago. On Yom Hashoah, we help to fulfill our collective responsibility to transmit the lessons of history, and we help to ensure that never again will a Holocaust happen to any people.

I am privileged to observe Yom Hashoah this year at the Simon Wiesenthal Center, where not only April 29, but every day is dedicated to perpetuating the memories of the Holocaust. The Center, through its outstanding Holocaust Museum and educational programs, has created a living memorial to the victims of the Holocaust and helped bring the truth of the Holocaust to America's communities at a time when some are working to convince Americans that the horror and inhumanity of the Holocaust never occurred.

I am also privileged to join with the Simon Wiesenthal Center in presenting the Center's Distinguished Service Award to Dr. William Perl, whose courage and commitment to life helped to save tens of thousands of Jews from mass extermination. Putting his own life at risk, Dr. Perl, an attorney in Vienna in 1938, was able to convince Nazi officials to release incarcerated Jews, and to put in motion a plan which eventually saw 40,000 European Jews reach Palestine. Dr. Perl's mission was the first of

its kind and was later to be emulated by other agencies involved in rescue operations.

Were it not for Dr. Perl's courage, many of us—our families, our parents, our children—would not be here today. It is my honor and privilege to present this award to Dr. Perl, whom all of humanity has to thank. As our tradition teaches, the saving of one life is tantamount to saving the whole world.●

AN AWARD FOR UNMERITORIOUS SERVICE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Intelligence Committee who understands that its ability to keep intelligence confidences is critical to its credibility, but also as a friend and an admirer of the distinguished chairman of that committee, I was appalled by the barely veiled accusation in a recent Wall Street Journal editorial that news of the CIA involvement in the mining of Nicaraguan harbors was somehow to be laid at the door of EDWARD BOLAND. I applauded the chairman's low-key response to that baseless accusation.

The Journal's backhanded correction that was printed below the chairman's letter offered little salve to the wound which its indiscriminate attack had attempted to make on his unblemished reputation for integrity. It was therefore with great appreciation that I read a recent commentary by Mr. Ray Jenkins, editor of the editorial page of the Baltimore Evening Sun, on this sad episode. His suggested headline "An Award for Unmeritorious Service" was never better deserved.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission that at this point in the RECORD a copy of Mr. BOLAND's letter to the Journal and Mr. Jenkin's excellent commentary be printed as a guide of how not to write editorials and how not to falsely sully the reputation of a true public servant.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 12, 1984.

EDITOR: WALL STREET JOURNAL,
1025 Connecticut Avenue NW,
Washington, DC.

To the EDITOR: It was with bemusement that I read your April 12 editorial, "Anatomy of a Cop Out," suggesting that news of the mining of Nicaraguan waters first appeared in the Washington Post "a few hours" after the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence had been briefed by the Administration.

The Committee was briefed on the mining on January 31, 1984. The first news report of the mining appeared on April 6. Further, the news did not break in the Washington Post but in the Wall Street Journal.

It is inexcusable that editorial writers, who have the luxury of time to check their facts, do not bother to do so. If the Journal editorial staff put as much effort into being accurate and avoiding unfounded innuendo

as they seem to put into apologetics for an insupportable policy against Nicaragua, they might soon begin to approach the professionalism of the Journal's reportorial staff.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Chairman.

COMMENTARY BY RAY JENKINS

In moments of candor, journalists will concede that the Pulitzer Prizes—which were announced this week—are akin to the Academy Awards: Both events are publicity extravaganzas in which members of a profession bestow honors upon one another.

This is not to say prizes are undeserved. The press does serious work, which ought to be recognized. Still, it is a fact that while achievement is celebrated, when it comes to self-criticism, the press goes blind.

This inability or unwillingness of the "fourth estate" to subject itself to the same intense scrutiny it brings to bear upon other institutions is a growing source of private bitterness among politicians and businessmen who labor under the all-seeing lens. Yet these people remain silent out of fear that if they speak they will only set off the old press firebell, "The First Amendment is in danger!"

Throwing caution into the wind, my old colleague Jody Powell has now broken the silence to settle scores with a vengeance. At the outset of his new book, "The Other Side of the Story," Jimmy Carter's press secretary states the indictment:

"Journalists share the same problems . . . with doctors, lawyers, farmers, business, labor, political parties, and much of organized religion. What sets journalists apart is that no one is looking over their shoulder, or at least no one who is in position to do much about what is seen . . . I firmly believe that journalists also ought to be held to a higher standard, maybe not so high as presidents and senators, but still higher than the rest of society."

The pernicious consequences that flow from this professional laxity compose the bulk of Jody's book.

So, taking my friend's admonition to heart, on this day after the Pulitzer Committee has awarded prizes for meritorious service, I propose an award for unmeritorious journalism. It goes, hands down, to the nation's largest newspaper, the Wall Street Journal. In all my 33 years of toiling in these vineyards I have not seen a less meritorious service than the outrage committed in a Journal editorial last week.

I speak not of the messy business about the Journal's columnist thought to have manipulated his newspaper for the profit of his friends. That's only a small embarrassment, really; faithless employees are found everywhere, every day. You simply fire them and get on with honest work.

Rather, my prize addresses a matter of far graver import—the scandalous mistreatment, admitted in a wholly inadequate and even deceptive manner, of a man who has served with distinction in the United States Congress for 32 years.

The Journal's attack on Rep. Edward P. Boland of Massachusetts appeared in an editorial last Thursday at the height of the uproar over the secret mining of Nicaragua's harbors. Almost alone among major newspapers, the Journal defended the mining and declared the real shame lay with the Republican Senate leaders who lacked the courage to stand behind their President

even though he was committing what Sen. Barry Goldwater called "an act of war."

The administration's only mistake, said the Journal in characteristic slashing manner, was to fulfill its obligation to notify that gaggle of hysterical flibbertigibbets parading as the Congress of the United States. Within "a few hours" after Boland's Intelligence Committee had been briefed on the secret mining, the editorial stated flatly, the sensational news was "leaked" to the Washington Post, which dutifully published it on the theory that "the public has a right to know everything except the motive of the source."

I could scarcely believe my eyes. My God, I thought, don't these editorial writers read their own newspaper?

If they had read the Journal's reliable news columns, as I do, they would have known that it was not the Washington Post, but rather the Wall Street Journal which prominently broke that story about the mining. Moreover, that story made it fairly clear that the source of the "leak" was not Boland, but rather Sen. Goldwater. (The role of the grand old man of American conservatism had been briefly noted in the editorial but excused, patronizingly, on the ground that Goldwater's memory was no longer reliable.)

In sum, the editorial rested upon a totally spurious foundation. The next day the Journal carried at the bottom of its letters-to-the-editor section, buried between the jokes column and a large ad, under a misleading headline, two paragraphs of cold fury from Congressman Boland, calling to the attention of the editors the story in their own newspaper. Boland went on, he had known of the mining for more than a month before the news broke. Yet, though he sharply disagreed with the policy, he had kept the secret.

Boland's letter was followed by a 13-line editor's note acknowledging that the editorial had relied upon false information practically accusing this 16-term congressman of committing the serious felony of releasing highly secret information to the detriment of the national security. The brief correction (though the word was never used) confessed that the editorial writer had relied upon private sources which sharply contradicted the news story carried a week earlier. "Our error," the editor said, "arose from the complaint of a well-respected source that the leaks had come from the House Committee."

With that, the case was closed. Without so much as a word of apology to Boland, the Journal editor chose instead to call a liar "well-respected" and further chose not to identify this liar, so that his credibility will remain unimpaired when he peddles more lies in the future. So much for the public's right to know "the motive of the source."

In his letter Boland acidly remarked that if the editors would check their facts, "they might soon begin to approach the professionalism of the Journal's reportorial staff."

As it happened, two Pulitzer Prizes went to the Journal yesterday—one for the superior work of its diplomatic correspondent Karen Elliott House, the other for columns of comment by Vermont Royster, the principled former editor of the Journal now retired but still writing occasional columns. Both prizes were richly deserved.

But as House and Royster bring honor to the newspaper, its editorial writers bring only shame.●

A TRIBUTE TO MR. DANIEL W. HOGAN, JR.

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding educator from my district, Mr. Daniel W. Hogan, Jr., of Stoneham. As the retiring superintendent of the Stoneham Public Schools, Mr. Hogan has demonstrated a commitment to education and excellence that makes all who know him proud.

During his 37 years of public service in education and 15 years as superintendent, Dan Hogan has excelled at every level of the education system. He worked his way up from a teacher-coach to superintendent of schools. He knows the education system from the classroom to the administrative offices. This unique background gave Dan Hogan the ability to perform as a well-qualified school administrator. I want to commend Dan Hogan for his distinguished years of service and I tell my colleagues that we would be fortunate if there were more Dan Hogans in education today.●

PHILADELPHIA AREA LAWYERS
OPPOSED TO REAGAN'S CENTRAL AMERICAN POLICY

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, more and more Americans are beginning to realize the folly of the Reagan administration's foreign policy, particularly in Central America. I would like to share with my colleagues the following statement signed by over 120 members of the Philadelphia area legal community which eloquently expresses their opinion of current American foreign policy in that region.

STATEMENT ON U.S. POLICY IN CENTRAL AMERICA

As members of the legal community, we believe that American foreign policy must be governed by the same respect for law and fundamental human rights that we expect of our government at home.

Recent events convince us that the present administration is moving the nation inexorably into armed conflict in Central America by pursuing a policy which is illegal, improper, and dangerous.

In El Salvador, the United States continues to send arms, military advisors and economic support to a government known internationally for its contempt for human rights. The wanton killing of civilians by right-wing death squads actually increased in the first six months of 1983. After three years, the soldiers accused of murdering 4 American churchwomen have yet to stand

trial. The first U.S. soldier has been killed by guerrillas; regrettably, others will certainly follow.

In Nicaragua, our government is financing, arming, and providing leadership for exile groups seeking to overthrow the recognized government. Last summer, the U.S. positioned two battle fleets off the coast of the country and sent some four thousand troops to Honduras as a thinly veiled military threat to the Nicaraguan government.

This policy is contrary to domestic and international law.

The introduction of U.S. armed forces into hostilities or into an area where there is imminent danger of hostilities requires the President to report such action to Congress, and to remove those troops within 60 days unless Congress specifically approves. President Reagan has not done so with respect to El Salvador, in violation of the War Powers Resolution, 50 U.S.C. § 1541, et seq.

The administration's support for armed troops invading Nicaragua violates the express terms of Articles 2 and 33 of the United Nations Charter, Articles 15, 16, 17 and 18 of the Charter of the Organization of American States, and Articles 1 and 2 of the Rio Treaty of 1949, all of which are binding upon the United States and prohibit military aggression or any other type of interference in the affairs of other sovereign states. It further violates our own Neutrality Act, 18 U.S.C. § 960.

United States support for the government of El Salvador violates Section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act, 22 U.S.C. § 2304, which prohibits security assistance to governments which engage in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights.

Although the Reagan administration professes to support negotiations, it has consistently favored military options in a futile effort to resolve political disputes by brute force. As these conflicts escalate, law and reason are among the first casualties.

The recklessness and danger of our present policy is underscored by the recent invasion of Grenada by 6,000 U.S. troops. No serious evidence has been produced to substantiate administration assertions that American citizens were in danger or that the Grenadian government posed an imminent threat to other countries in the Caribbean. The invasion in fact violates numerous treaties to which the United States is a party. The General Assembly of the U.N. condemned the invasion, and a similar resolution was prevented from passing in the Security Council only by a United States veto. Aside from the inherent illegality of the invasion, it can only further encourage armed conflict in Central America.

We are guided by the lessons of Vietnam, which remind us that no amount of aid or troops can substitute for popular support for a government. We also remember that an undeclared war, costing billions of dollars and thousands of lives, can begin with a few military advisors and the unwillingness to let people in other countries shape their own history. Finally, we recall all too well how easily covert wars abroad can become overt attacks on civil liberties and political rights here at home.

In making this statement, we take no position in favor of the guerrillas in El Salvador or the policies of the government in Nicaragua or Grenada. We are concerned only that the policies of our own government should conform to the requirements of law and justice.

We therefore call upon our government to take the following steps immediately:

1. Immediately withdraw all troops and weapons from Grenada.

2. Withdraw its fleet from the coast of Nicaragua and end all exercises involving U.S. combat troops in the region.

3. End all aid and support, open or covert, for attempts to destabilize or overthrow the government of Nicaragua.

4. Adhere strictly to the requirements of the War Powers Resolution governing the commitment of U.S. armed forces anywhere in Central America.

5. Pursue a negotiated settlement to the present conflicts in the region. In particular, the administration should pursue recent proposals which would result in the withdrawal of all outside aid and military advisors to the countries in Central America.

The memory, the losses, the anguish of Vietnam continue to weigh heavily on this nation. We all have an obligation to insure that such a tragedy is not repeated. Our best hope is to see that American foreign policy is guided by our commitment to democracy and human rights under the Constitution and international law.

Signed,

Barbara Bailey, Denise J. Baker, Michael Barba, Linda S. Battistini, Michael P. Berger, Harold Berk, Jocelyn Block, Amelia H. Boss, Ellen Boylan, Dennis D. Brogan, Donald S. Bronstein.

Donna L. Calame, Michael J. Carroll, Anne Chiarello, Bruce G. Conley, Regina M. Coyne, Elaine DeMasse, Karen Detamore, Diane V. Elliot, Jules Epstein, Daniel J. Farrell, Janet L. Fayter.

Carmen M. Garcia, Paul M. George, Terry J. Green, Daniel Halevy, Florice Hoffman, Barbara C. Joseph, David Kairys, June Kapler, Ira Jay Katz, Jay S. Koplove, Jerry Kristal.

Phyllis H. Allen, Karl Baker, Richard S. Bank, Deane Bartlett, Susan Baturin, Susan Bergin, Marc Bookman, Shara Bothwell, Bradley Bridge, Margaret R. Brogan.

Teresa M. Burzynski, Catherine C. Carr, Ellen M. Casey, Roger S. Clark, Bernadette Coughlin, Rosalie Davies, Rosemary J. Dempsey, Karen E. Dicks, Russel S. Endo, Sabrina Sigal Falls, David Faye.

William Galvin, Joseph P. Gavin, Jr., Steven Goldman, Janet H. Greenlee, Julie Hall, Marilyn T. Jamain, James L. Kahn, Ilene Kalman, Harold Katz, Kathleen E. Kitson, Andrew T. Lamas.

Carol Finkelstein Laskin, Jack Levine, Theodore M. Lieverman, Benjamin G. Lipman, Phillip M. Lord, Bruce M. Ludwig, Patrick J. Mandracchia, Bernard J. McFadden, Patricia McInerney, Carol McNeill.

Margarita Navarro-Rivera, Gail L. Newbold, Linda A. Peyton, Jean E. Purnell, Claire Rauscher, Kathleen Ridolfi, Nina Rossi, David Rudovsky, Wayne Sachs, Elizabeth A. Savitt.

Karl Schwartz, Julie Shapiro, Robert A. Sloan, C. S. Strickler, Jr., Jacqueline Thompson, Philip H. Troxler, David W. Webber, Solomon Weinstein, Alan L. Yattrin.

Frank Ledahawsky, Cathy J. Levine, Gail Lopez-Henriquez, Harry Lore, Holly Maguigan, Angela Martinez, Kay McGahen, Reed McManigle, Paul Messing.

Mary Beth Neilson, Robert E. Paul, Lisa Ellen Price, Luisa Ragonese, Peter Reilly, Peter Rossi, Samuel A. Rossitto, Steven R. Sachs, Ellen Samel.

Henry W. Sawyer, III, Mark Scott-Ledley, John E. Shields, Jr., Jenny Steinen, Phyllis H. Subin, Michael B. Tolcott, Kevin Walker, Laura Gardner Webster, Janet R. Wintner, Suzanne J. Young.●

TESTIMONY OF SOL M. LINOWITZ BEFORE THE HOUSE FOREIGN OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, April 12, former Ambassador Sol Linowitz testified before the House Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee on administration's policy in Central America. In addition to serving as special negotiator for the Middle East, Mr. Linowitz chaired a recent highly distinguished international commission which made significant recommendations concerning the problem of Central America in general and El Salvador in particular.

Ambassador Linowitz's testimony clearly indicates that resistance on the part of thoughtful people to administration policy in Central America is not based on a lack of recognition of the area's importance to the United States. It is, rather, based on a concern that the policy is so poorly thought through that in the words of Mr. Linowitz it will, in the end, "give us neither peace nor security." I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Linowitz's statement:

TESTIMONY OF SOL M. LINOWITZ BEFORE THE HOUSE FOREIGN OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee: I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the conflicts in Central America and what the United States might do to facilitate an early and peaceful end to the bloody struggles going on there.

Last year, the former President of Ecuador and Secretary General of the OAS, Galo Plaza, and I were co-chairmen of an Inter-American Dialogue—a group of about 50 business, government, academic, political and Church leaders from Latin America, the Caribbean, Canada and the United States. Our group included people of different political tendencies, professional backgrounds, cultures and generations—people of responsibility and stature in their home countries. We met several times in working groups and plenary sessions over a period of six months. Last April, we released a report, *The Americas at a Crossroads*, reflecting the results of our discussions. Part of our report was on the crisis in Central America. We emphasized the danger that its intense civil conflicts could escalate and spread, drawing other nations, including the United States, into more direct involvement.

Last month the Inter-American Dialogue reconvened for a second round of discussions. We are now in the process of preparing a new report to be released in mid-May. Once again, Central America will be one of the major issues upon which we focus.

I am here today to share with you my personal views on the situation in Central America, and El Salvador in particular. But I would be remiss if I did not note that my views have been much informed by the extended discussions our Dialogue conducted around these difficult issues.

The crisis in Central America has deepened dramatically in the past year. The civil war in El Salvador has intensified, with the result that the number of casualties and the amount of destruction have increased sharply. The election of several weeks ago confirms the Salvadoran people's continuing desire for democracy and an end to violence, but offers little prospect of ending that nation's fratricidal conflict.

Nicaragua has continued its military buildup, raising an army 50,000 strong, causing understandable alarm among its neighbors. Attacks on Nicaragua by counter-revolutionary groups based in Honduras and Costa Rica have become broader and more destructive. The recent mining of Nicaragua ports has introduced a dangerous new international dimension to the conflict by placing in jeopardy the shipping of nations outside the region.

Honduras has become a virtual armed camp, and its embryonic civilian democracy is in danger of being overwhelmed by huge amounts of military assistance. The United States, meanwhile, has conducted military training exercises of unprecedented size and duration for this part of the world off the Nicaraguan coast and on the territory of Honduras. Regardless of intent, they raise the spectre in Central America, and throughout Latin America, of possible U.S. intervention, or of prolonged U.S. military involvement. These fears are reinforced by reports that substantial U.S. military facilities are being constructed in Honduras.

In Guatemala, another military coup has done nothing to stop the internal bleeding of that country. Even democratic Costa Rica now fears it may be drawn into the regional maelstrom.

Here in the United States, the debate over how we should respond to the Central American crisis has grown more heated. The Congress has been reluctant to endorse the Administration's proposals for sharp increases in military and economic assistance without a clearer sense of the direction of our overall policy. The recommendations of the Kissinger Commission contain some important proposals, but they do not chart a different course and have failed to achieve the bipartisan consensus sought.

The one bright spot in the Central American picture is the significant movement towards peace that has been achieved by the efforts of the Contadora nations—Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia and Panama. They have met often among themselves and with representatives of the nations of Central America, and have achieved agreement in principle on a broad spectrum of economic, political and security issues. These agreements must now be translated into formal, verifiable agreements—no easy task.

But the progress the Contadora governments have made has been considerable, and their efforts deserve the active support of everyone who seeks a peaceful solution to the regional conflict.

The search for an early and peaceful end to the conflict in El Salvador is, in many ways, one of the most difficult tasks within the broader search for peace and security in Central America. At stake in this conflict is nothing less than the future course of Salvadoran society and politics. The contending parties are not easily drawn to compromise.

Like many others, I have become increasingly concerned about the situation in El Salvador and in the region generally. Over the past few years, U.S. involvement in the Salvadoran conflict has grown substantially,

whether we measure it by the amount of U.S. military assistance provided to the government, the participation of U.S. advisors in training the Salvadoran armed forces, or the reported role of the United States in military intelligence-gathering.

In just the past few weeks, it has been reported in the press that U.S. personnel are flying intelligence missions over El Salvador from Honduras, and that U.S. ground troops have been sent to the border between El Salvador and Honduras to act as a "back-stop" for Salvadoran military operations across the border.

The problems of El Salvador are deeply rooted in the social, economic and political history of that nation. No U.S. Administration is responsible for the crisis that exists today. Although the United States might have taken actions in the past that would have ameliorated the problems that have now become acute, responsibility for failing to do so must be shared by several Administrations, Republican and Democrat alike.

It is my firm belief that the course we are currently on will not resolve the problems of the region and will not bring us either peace or security. If we are to find an approach that will successfully secure the real interests we have at stake in Central America, we must rethink the difficult problems we face there.

I believe that the United States does have a security interest in Central America. I believe we share with our neighbors in the Hemisphere an interest in preventing the extension of Soviet and Cuban military force into the region. Similarly, we have an interest in assuring that no nation in the Hemisphere contributes to the subversion of its neighbors.

We also have an important interest in reversing the current trend toward escalating military conflict and tension in Central America. Peace is an essential precondition for economic recovery, not to speak of future development. War, or the threat of war, diverts scarce resources from the pressing needs of the economy. In both Nicaragua and El Salvador, economic growth has been crippled by the destruction of economic infrastructure built up over many years.

Moreover, the escalation of conflict offers opportunities for the growth of Cuban and Soviet influence. Their comparative advantage is in providing the weapons of war, not in providing the resources or models for peaceful economic development.

And finally, we have an interest in seeing the emergence in Central America of governments willing to address the basic social and economic concerns of the majority of their citizens. Such governments offer the only real guarantee of long-term peace and stability.

With these objectives firmly in mind, I believe we can define basic principles to guide our policy towards El Salvador and towards the rest of Central America.

We should make it clear to Cuba and the Soviet Union that the United States will not accept their deployment of combat forces, or establishment of military bases anywhere in Central America or the Caribbean.

We should give strong and active assistance to the efforts of the Contadora nations to facilitate an agreement among the Central American nations that would ban foreign troops and bases from the area, and would limit the number of foreign military advisors.

We should recommit ourselves to the principle of non-intervention, overt or covert, as we call upon others to do the same. Here,

too, we should actively support efforts of the Contadora nations to facilitate verifiable agreements limiting the armed forces and armaments of each Central American nation and prohibiting any nation from assisting insurgents fighting against a neighboring government.

In El Salvador there is little prospect of a military victory. The continued pursuit of it will serve only to prolong the stalemate, deepening the war and spreading it to neighboring countries. The toll in death and destruction will mount, as will the danger of a regional conflagration. If the government of El Salvador wants continued U.S. assistance, it should be prepared to make a real and concerted effort to enter into discussions with the opposition with the aim of reaching a negotiated end to the war. The Salvadoran people have the right to choose their own leaders through open, democratic elections. But all the contending parties should be assured that these elections will be conducted in an atmosphere free of coercion, and open to free debate on the full range of issues. All parties have the right to be assured that the elections will be free from fraud, and that their results will be accepted.

It is impossible to establish such conditions so long as the apparatus of the death squads remains intact, and so long as the regular security forces of El Salvador continue their pattern of human rights violations without fear of punishment. A substantial improvement in the Salvadoran government's regard for human rights is therefore a necessary precondition for significant progress towards peace.

We should make clear to the government of El Salvador that we will not continue an open-ended military commitment. The United States should use its substantial leverage with the Salvadoran government to advance the prospects for peace. We should not expect miracles. There is no quick or easy solution. But if we are united in our own commitment to reducing the violence in the short term and to assisting the long-term development of El Salvador, I believe that we can assist the Salvadoran people in their search for peace and justice. ●

DEFICITS: CHALLENGES AHEAD

HON. W. G. (BILL) HEFNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, the House has acted with dispatch and responsibility this year on the grave problem of Federal deficits. But much, much more remains to be done in the months and years ahead.

House Budget Committee Chairman JAMES R. JONES of Oklahoma recently addressed the Washington Press Club on the challenges we have yet to meet. The gentleman from Oklahoma has provided splendid leadership to this body as we have attempted to deal with national fiscal policy.

His thoughts on what lies ahead should be studied carefully by us all.

DEFICITS: CHALLENGES AHEAD

Washington Press Club Members, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The next president of the United States will be the leader of this nation on the

200th anniversary of the Constitution. That will be one of the great milestones in the history of democracy.

The Constitution has proven to be a great and enduring plan of government. It has provided this nation with the means to grow and change to meet new challenges. Today I would like to discuss three of the major challenges ahead.

I also want to issue a challenge to the American press corps.

In 1981, major battles were fought in Washington—and particularly in the Congress—over the shape and substance of government. It is my belief that those battles were covered more as sports events than as substantive issues determining the social and economic future of this nation.

The challenge I see for the press is this. Throughout this election campaign and through the critical first year of the next presidency, you must focus the debate on substance. You must force the candidates to face up to the major issues before this nation and you must force them to declare how they intend to deal with those issues.

You can present this nation with no better gift than shaping this election in such a way that on our 200th anniversary we will have a president and a Congress equipped to solve the complex problems now facing us.

As to the budget, I have the distinct impression that many of my friends in the press are near the level of overdosing on deficit stories. For you, I fear, there is no comfort, no solace, no respite. You and I are fated, like Sisyphus, to keep rolling the deficit rock up the hill for some more years to come.

To begin at the beginning, under policies in effect on January 1, 1981, the deficit in fiscal 1987 would have been \$39 billion. Under the policies put in place under Ronald Reagan and in effect on January 1, 1984, the deficit in fiscal 1987 would be \$248 billion.

What we have done in the House of Representatives in recent days is make an effort to staunch the bleeding and avoid the full-scale collapse of the U.S. economy and with it the world economic system as we know it today.

The House, I contend with some degree of pride, has been able to put in place, and will be able to enforce, a deficit reduction program far larger than most observers would have deemed possible at the beginning of this year.

The House, with the votes of 229 Democrats and 21 Republicans, has acted with commendable responsibility.

We have moved to cut domestic spending by \$17 billion over the next three years, continuing the slowing of expenditures in this area. And just as important, we did it while protecting the poor and the needy, and providing real growth in safety net programs.

On defense, we have moved to reduce spending by \$95 billion from the level sought by the Pentagon. We have proposed 1987 defense outlays of \$304 billion, compared to \$134 billion in 1980 and \$234 billion in 1984. Defense spending increases, while still large, would be brought under control, reduced to a level where the Defense Department has an opportunity to spend its billions efficiently.

On revenues, we have acted to raise an additional \$49 billion, a level to which all parties have agreed. There is one potential problem here, and that is President Reagan's threat to veto this tax increase if it is

not accompanied by some undefined level of domestic spending cuts. I can only say that such a veto would rank very high on the scale of unwise and counterproductive actions and I cannot believe that Ronald Reagan would do such a thing.

The total result of our deficit reduction effort is \$182 billion over three years. More would have been better, and I fully agree with Paul Volcker that about \$50 billion in fiscal 1985 would have been economically desirable, compared to the \$30 billion we were able to achieve in the first year.

However, I believe we put together close to the maximum package which the U.S. Congress can pass this year and which the President will sign into law.

This assumes that the Senate will pull itself together, perhaps talk a little less about what it plans to do, and get something done. The House has shown itself capable of effective action, and the Senate must do the same. Granted, the Republican majority in the Senate faces a tough choice between fair, effective and realistic budgeting on one hand and loyalty to a Republican President on the other. But I trust in the end they will put national interest above election year politics and produce an honest budget.

That was the good news. The bad news is that the \$182 billion reduction package, by coincidence, will lead to a 1987 deficit of \$182 billion under the budget we have passed. That assumes steady economic growth.

What our recent actions have done is take the Titanic which was moving full speed ahead through the fog and order that look-outs be posted and speed slowed. We still have important personages aboard who prefer to drink champagne and waltz while ignoring the danger ahead. We still have massive momentum carrying us toward disaster.

But we have bought ourselves a little time, a little breathing room, a chance to save ourselves.

We have done this largely by using baling wire and chewing gum to hold together a machine that is dangerously close to falling apart. In the 99th Congress we must put aside emergency repairs and turn to major structural reform.

The tax system, the military system, and the health care system must be reformed.

It is, I will propose, a major responsibility of the press during this campaign year to force all candidates to focus on these key areas. Genuine reform will be so controversial and so difficult that it can only be executed successfully with firm leadership from a president and bipartisan action by Congress.

The candidates, all of them, should be forced to commit themselves in these areas so that the electorate can judge on substance. Side issues should not divert our attention.

Ronald Reagan demonstrated in 1981 that an active president with a cooperative Congress can make dramatic changes in public policy. I believe that many of the changes executed in 1981 were wrong. Indeed, those actions are responsible for the fiscal mess we are in today. But President Reagan did lay to rest the theory that nothing can be done.

Unfortunately, since that time, the President has played a relatively inactive role and few major initiatives have occurred.

A new window of opportunity will exist in 1985. The American people are crying out for tax reform. The American people are

ahead of the Washington establishment in knowing in their bones that the military needs overhaul. And the threat of trust fund bankruptcy tells us all that something must be done about health care.

Let's concentrate most heavily today on the military. I do not intend to downplay the importance of foreign policy in this area. American foreign policy is in dangerous disarray and confusion, and this too must be a major focus of the election decision. But this failure is not so much structural as it is the result of the personal failures of the persons involved.

Even the finest military organization will be inadequate under the sort of policies to which we are now committed, nevertheless, we must move toward a major military reform.

Why? What is wrong with our present defense establishment?

Here is a list.

Our defense policy, which should be utilized to support (and be consistent with) our foreign policy, does not. There is no clear indication as to how our defense program is supporting our foreign policy or even what our foreign policy is.

Current defense policy planning for so-called world-wide contingencies is so ill-defined and open-ended as to be unrealistic and unaffordable. This makes it impossible to accurately define personnel, or materials requirements, and therefore, funding requirements.

The Soviet threat is consistently exaggerated to justify massive defense spending increases.

Funding requirements in the last three years have been based more on a "wish list" by the military services rather than setting realistic priorities. Virtually no service requests for major systems or programs have been rejected by the Administration. Civilian control of the military has been relatively nonexistent in the Administration.

Increases in the defense budget have occurred so rapidly and been so massive that they have not been managed effectively or efficiently by the Pentagon.

Duplication and overlap among the four services exists to an excessive, unacceptable degree.

The military retirement system is outdated and expensive. It provides incentives for our military personnel to leave the service at the peak of their careers.

Despite the proclaimed efforts of this Administration, waste, fraud and abuse still appear to be widespread. Stories of spare parts costing 10 or 20 times what they should appear all too often.

The military procurement process is highly inefficient. There is little real competition and the Pentagon manages the process poorly.

Congress shares some of the blame. Despite its budget cutting rhetoric, members add money each year for pet projects not requested by the Pentagon and refuse to allow the military to close unneeded bases.

The Pentagon is pursuing unrealistic or unobtainable objectives such as: Ballistic missile defense, Protracted nuclear war capability, and 90-day ammunition and logistics support for USA NATO forces while allies have only 45 days.

This Administration is pursuing unneeded or duplicative programs such as:

Five bomber or bomber type programs (B-52 upgrades, B-1B, stealth bomber, air-launched-cruise missile, stealth ALCM.)

What should be done?

We must establish a clear, forward looking, rational, long range foreign policy. We

must identify and prioritize areas of the world that are vital to U.S. interest and which we must be capable of helping to defend.

Our defense programs should follow from the requirements of our foreign policy. They should be consistent with our allies and economically affordable.

We must ensure that our military services set priorities guided by that clearly defined policy.

We must reassert civilian control of the military ensuring adequate decision making review by the civilian executives in the office of Secretary of Defense and the Office of Management and Budget.

We must establish and stick to an affordable long-term defense funding profile. This will require the Pentagon to set priorities and move effectively and efficiently to manage its available resources.

We must totally overhaul our procurement process and build more competition in defense contracting.

We must reduce waste, fraud, and abuse in the Defense Department to the absolute minimum by making this a high priority objective.

Finally, we must reform the office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is unreasonable to expect that the members of the Joint Chiefs and their staffs can objectively wear two hats. On the one hand they are expected to be the principal military advisers to the Secretary of Defense and the President, and on the other they head up their respective service. The need for broad objective military analysis and advice is often sacrificed for the more parochial views and needs of the individual services. It is essential that reforms along the lines of those called for by former JCS Chairman, General David Jones and former Army Chief of Staff, General Edwin Meyer, to strengthen the position and staff of the Joint Chiefs, occur as soon as possible.

The Chairman should be designated as the senior military advisor to the Secretary of Defense and the President.

The Chairman should be in the formal operational chain of command and have a personal staff of adequate size and high quality reporting to him.

The Chairman should be independent of any service.

There should be a Deputy Chairman of four star rank.

Procedures should be established to ensure that service on the staff of the Joint Chiefs is not detrimental to a military career, but instead is career enhancing.

Health care delivery also requires massive reform. Medicare will go bankrupt between 1989 and 1995. Health care costs for the nation were \$322 billion in 1982, more than 10% of our entire GNP, and these costs continue to escalate far more rapidly than the general rate of inflation. Some 30-40 million Americans have no health care coverage and millions more can be wiped out by a medical catastrophe.

Next year I expect that the Congress and the White House will have to put together a Medicare rescue effort on the lines of last year's Social Security Commission.

Beyond that, there must soon be a massive debate and decision process devoted to health care in general, not just the portion paid for by the federal government.

The tax system. The beloved tax system. The biggest mystery is why millions of Americans have not done what the farmers did a few years ago—march into town, take over the Mall, swamp the halls of Congress,

surround the White House and demand action.

The present system is beyond repair. It fails in its purpose of raising adequate revenue. It fails in its purpose of promoting economic efficiency. It fails in its purpose of fairly distributing the burden of taxes.

There are numerous options available—a value-added tax; a national sales tax; a personal consumption tax; a progressive, broad-based income tax.

Each option has problems. Every option will be subject to attack, but in the end we must choose.

I will be happy to take questions on all of these subjects, but let me tell you now that I have not reached final conclusions in the health and tax areas. Now that the main budget battles for this year are over, my full attention will be on these subjects and the results will eventually be available through the University of Illinois Press.

Here are three great areas requiring structural reform. That will not be easy to accomplish. It will be far easier politically to do nothing than to take on these problems and correct them.

And nothing will be accomplished in these areas without strong, effective leadership from a vigorous, newly-elected president.

I do not presume to predict who that president will be. But I do presume that the press should play a vigorous and vital role between now and November of pressing the candidates on the substance of these issues. Indeed, you should demand that the candidates address these issues forthrightly.

This country needs a president who will provide real leadership, a president who will face complex and difficult issues and lead the development of national consensus on national issues.

I will do my best to press the candidates in the Democratic Party on these issues. I fear I have little power to press President Reagan. But I do believe that the members of the Press can be successful in forcing all candidates to demonstrate to the American people their commitment to correcting these glaring flaws in our government policies.●

INFRASTRUCTURE: INDIANA AND THE NATION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report for Wednesday, April 18, 1984, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

INFRASTRUCTURE: INDIANA AND THE NATION

Although there is quite a bit less discussion of "infrastructure" today than there was a few years ago, the condition of roads, bridges, ports, and water systems in Indiana and across the nation is no better. Indeed, the policy of "build it and forget it" is beginning to catch up with us.

The longer we delay the restoration of key transportation and water systems, whether in Indiana or elsewhere in the United States, the harder and more expensive the task will become. But the issue is not just how we pay for public works. An adequate supply of clean water and the quick and easy movement of people and goods are essential to future economic growth. With

this in mind, Congress's Joint Economic Committee set up an advisory panel to study infrastructure and to make recommendations on how to finance its construction and repair. By the time it was completed, the study encompassed 23 states.

Few people were surprised when the advisory panel uncovered a problem, but the severity of the problem was another matter. Although the nation's various regions have differing requirements, all have important needs. While the Northeast and Midwest encounter the growing deterioration of facilities built decades ago, the South and the West cannot keep up with new demand for expansion. No state has enough cash to meet its needs through the end of the decade, but this is to be expected because overall spending on infrastructure fell from 1.5% to 0.8% of the gross national product between 1971 and 1981.

The advisory panel estimated that to meet tomorrow's needs, the United States must increase planned spending on infrastructure by more than \$440 billion through the year 2000. We will be \$265 billion short in our effort to construct and repair of highways and bridges. For mass transit, the spending gap is \$88 billion. For waste water collection and treatment it is \$49 billion, and for water supply and distribution it is \$41 billion. Researchers at Indiana University who assisted the advisory panel found that our state will need \$52 billion for public facilities over the next 17 years, but that only \$24 billion will be on hand. If not addressed, the \$28-billion shortfall will prevent Indiana's economy from growing as rapidly as it should. The harsh truth is that Indiana's shortfall is the fourth largest among the states surveyed. Only Ohio, New York, and California, all larger states, have bigger gaps. As to spending for highways, Indiana has the greatest per capita need of all—\$309 for every Hoosier through the end of the century.

The advisory panel also found that while the problem is severe, it is manageable. The extra \$450 billion required for infrastructure in the next decade and a half is an enormous sum, but it is within reach. The advisory panel's estimates are far less troublesome than some, which have put the additional cost of building and refurbishing infrastructure in the trillions.

What did the advisory panel suggest that we do? It is time to state clearly a long-term policy on the management of infrastructure. The policy must have several elements.

First, we must determine, state by state, what infrastructure we actually need. Surprising as it may seem, the United States today simply does not have the ability to assess its needs. This makes it impossible for federal, state, and local governments to pursue a coordinated strategy of investment and management. Congress should require the President to present, as part of his annual budget, an analysis of federal capital expenditure. The Senate has already passed a bill to require this, and the House of Representatives should do likewise. Putting all the information together in one place would help public officials establish priorities, rather than approach needs piecemeal, as we do now.

Second, Congress should initiate a review of the stringent technical standards which govern construction of public works. Written years ago, many of these standards have unnecessarily high economic, social, and environmental costs. If some are no longer appropriate, they should be eliminated. Also, Congress should re-evaluate carefully the statutory and administrative rules that

govern existing federal assistance for public works. The federal government is not always the best manager of scarce financial resources. If states and towns are given more latitude in the investment of federal dollars, those dollars may be invested better.

Finally, there is the matter of money. Cognizant that we must neither increase the debt carried by states and towns nor enlarge the huge deficit of the federal government, Congress should consider a National Infrastructure Fund to finance the construction and repair of public facilities across the country. The fund would establish a long-term partnership among all levels of government in order to increase the capital available for infrastructure. It would raise money by selling bonds and would use the proceeds to capitalize projects in all states. If Congress subsidized the interest on the bonds, state and local governments could get inexpensive loans to expand and improve their transportation and water systems. The loans would be repaid eventually from state and local taxes and fees, but until repayment the money could be recycled to pay for other projects. Congress should take special note of the advantages of a National Infrastructure Fund. Among other things, it leaves selection and management of projects with state and local authorities, it avoids overloading the tax-exempt credit market with another competitor, and it limits federal costs to reimbursement of interest, a sum manageable despite the budget crisis.

We must raise investment in infrastructure. Failure to do so will crimp the competitiveness of our economy, something we cannot afford.

(NOTE.—Material for this newsletter was taken from "Hard Choices," a comprehensive report on infrastructure prepared and published under the auspices of the Joint Economic Committee, a 20-member House-Senate body that advises Congress on economic policy.)

BUSINESS WEEK: "NO WELFARE FAT LEFT TO TRIM"

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the current trend of trimming fat off Federal programs is a step this Nation must take in order to get its fiscal house in order. However, though there may be waste in certain programs, the welfare fat has been trimmed to the bone. As Business Week points out, the population living under the poverty level has increased 44 percent as a result of welfare budget cuts. Current programs of Federal aid are dangerously close to the minimum level of support a wealthy nation such as ours should provide to its citizens. I urge that no further cuts be made in the welfare programs, for if there are; these cuts may never heal.

I have included the Business Week article for my colleagues:

[From Business Week, Mar. 26, 1984]

WHY THERE'S NO WELFARE FAT LEFT TO TRIM

When Ronald Reagan was campaigning for the Presidency in 1980, his promise to eliminate waste and fraud in federal programs for the poor struck a responsive chord in the electorate. And the response was heard loud and clear on Capitol Hill. Congress readily agreed to Reagan's proposals for deep slashes in a broad array of welfare programs—reductions that greatly toughened eligibility standards for food stamps, Medicaid, and other major benefit programs.

The drive to cap welfare costs was a smashing success. Adjusted for inflation, spending for welfare programs was no higher in fiscal 1984 than in 1980, and excluding Medicaid, was 5% lower: \$24.9 billion in 1984 vs. \$26.1 billion in 1980. For 1985, federal aid for the poor totals \$78 billion—less than 8.5% of total government expenditures, compared with 10% five years ago. Even the bureaucracy has been reduced. Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), a \$5.9 billion program, is currently administered by 757 employees, down from 1,118 two years ago. Similar administrative reductions have been made in other welfare programs.

As a result of this clear sweep, politicians and welfare experts generally agree that there is little room left for additional cuts. Says Henry Aaron, former assistant secretary of the Health, Education & Welfare Dept.: "This closet has been cleaned."

The concern now is that the cuts already made have actually reduced the living standard of the average welfare family. The 1981-1982 recession lowered the incomes of millions of Americans to the point of eligibility for food stamps, AFDC, and Medicaid. The Census Bureau estimates that between 1979 and 1982, the population living below the poverty line rose 44%, to 29 million—even after accounting for the value of government benefits. (The poverty line for a three-person family was \$7,693 in 1982.) But under the new eligibility standards, the government will pay less this year for welfare—in inflation-adjusted dollars than it did in fiscal 1980.

COST CULPRITS

Under AFDC, for instance, a Milwaukee single mother of three recalls that she received \$524 monthly in 1981. Today she works parttime at a clerical job that pays her, at the minimum wage, \$198 a month. Nevertheless, her total income, including her reduced AFDC payment, adds up to roughly the same amount that she received in 1981. Although her rent has remained at \$250, utilities, food, clothes, and transportation costs have all gone up; Medicaid requires her to pay \$1 or \$2 for a doctor's visit instead of covering the full cost; and her teen-age son eats more than the 34¢ worth of food per meal that her food stamps allow. Toward the end of each month, she says: "It's between heat and eat."

The one program whose cost continues to rise rapidly is Medicaid, which provides free medical care to the poor and to those defined by states as "medically needy." The program, which cost \$6.8 billion in 1975, will draw \$20.3 billion from the Treasury this year, with states chipping in an additional \$18 billion. The cost culprits are both the increasing cost of medical care in general and the rapid rise in the population of the very old—many of whom become eligible for Medicaid benefits after exhausting their savings on medical bills. In general, medic-

aid, not medicare, pays for nursing home care for the chronically ill aged.

The prospects for major savings in medicare are bleak without a solution to the overall problem of health care costs. The conservative Heritage Foundation argues that \$3 billion could be saved in fiscal 1985 by freezing federal payments to states for medicare at the 1984 level. But this would require draconian cuts, for which there does not appear to be any political support. The national commitment to provide medical care to the poor seems firm.

In 1981, federal payments to the states, which actually administer the medicare program, were reduced by 3% from what they would have been under prior law, with the percentage reduction rising to 4.5% in the current fiscal year. In its fiscal 1985 budget, the Administration proposes to reinstate the 3% reduction for a year. Another plan, sponsored by Finance Committee Chairman Robert J. Dole (R-Kan.), would reduce the payment to states by 3% a year only through fiscal 1987. The committee estimates a \$1.2 billion saving over three years. Under either plan, the states would get only \$97 for each \$100 they would have received under prior law.

FROZEN FEES

The states fiercely oppose the latest proposals because they would put tremendous pressure on them either to reduce services or to further restrict eligibility. At a February meeting in Washington, members of the National Governors' Assn. lobbied the White House and Congress hard in an effort to stop the cuts. Instead of reductions, the states want to be given greater flexibility to change the medicare program at the state level.

Some flexibility already exists. The 1981 law gave the states increased discretion to define eligibility and use innovative cost-cutting techniques. California, for example, began negotiating fees with hospitals for medicare instead of reimbursing hospitals directly for their costs. North Carolina froze physicians' fees, set up prospective reimbursement for hospitals, and eliminated dependent members of poor families aged 19 to 21 from medicare coverage. "We really had to put on the brakes," says Barbara D. Matula, North Carolina's medicare director and chair of the state medicare Directors Assn. "We just didn't have \$20 million to replace lost federal funds." While preliminary results of the experiments are encouraging, experts believe it is much too early to judge their effectiveness.

But the biggest cost problems in medicare are mostly beyond the reach of the states. The elderly, the chronically ill, and the mentally retarded make up only one-quarter of the population eligible for medicare, but they account for two-thirds of the program's cost. Some 50% of the nation's growing nursing home population has its expenses paid, fully or in part, by medicare. States were given limited authority in 1981 to provide medical services for the infirm elderly in their homes rather than in costly institutions, and 30 states have adopted such programs. The federal government fears, however, that if home care is expanded, people who would not have gone into nursing homes will demand home or community care. As a result, a program designed to save money could end up increasing costs.

OUTSIDE TREATMENT

Among the severely retarded, the population eligible for medicare has remained stable, but inflation has driven the cost of

services so high that care of the retarded is among the fastest-growing components of the program. It rose at an average annual rate of 33% between 1977 and 1982. Growth has been slowed somewhat, part because 1981 changes allowed treatment outside of institutions. The Congressional Budget Office believes that by giving states matching funds to expand community-based care, \$2 billion a year could be saved by 1989—provided that tight controls are placed on the growth of the eligible population.

In contrast to medicare, there appears to be no possibility whatever for significant cuts in the second-largest federal welfare program, food stamps—used in lieu of cash to buy domestically produced food items. The 1981 budget cuts dropped the gross income establishing family eligibility from 150% of the federally defined poverty level to 130%. In addition, Congress eliminated the scheduled 1982 inflation adjustment of benefits and restricted total monthly allotments of the stamps to 99% of the Agriculture Dept.'s "thrifty food" budget. The combined effect of these changes, Administration officials say, was to make certain that only the truly poor qualify for food stamps and that the level of benefits is just barely enough to provide adequate nutrition for beneficiaries. In fact, benefits are more likely to be increased this year than to be cut. Reagan's own hunger commission recommended that the maximum benefit level be restored to 100% of the thrifty food plan.

MILK MONEY

The only serious proposal to cut food stamp costs that is still on the table is the Administration's call to trim administrative costs by imposing additional penalties on states that make excessive errors in determining benefit levels and eligibility, saving \$503 million in fiscal 1985. Because these cuts would come from the federal payments to the states for administering the program, they would not directly affect beneficiaries. But critics charge that the proposed error-rate standards are unreasonable and that, in any event, reducing the funds that are available for program administration is likely to increase—not reduce—errors.

Larger savings are possible in other nutrition programs, particularly school lunches, which benefit the middle class as well as the poor. The CBO estimates that \$310 million a year could be saved by 1989 by eliminating all subsidies to schools for providing meals to students whose family incomes exceed 185% of the poverty level. And almost everyone except Congress agrees that the special milk program, which provides subsidized milk to schools that do not participate in the school lunch program, could be eliminated for a saving of almost \$20 million a year.

HOUSING SUBSIDIES

The one area of the welfare budget other than medicare whose cost seems to be rising rapidly is housing assistance, but here the budget data are seriously misleading. Because of the nature of budget accounting, much of the \$11 billion in outlays planned for fiscal 1985 actually reflects the cost of subsidized housing built during the 1970s under programs that have since been eliminated. Although Congress, particularly the Democratic-controlled House, still supports subsidized housing, the Administration has all but ended the program. Only 10,000 units are proposed in the 1985 budget, all of them for the elderly or handicapped.

The Administration favors getting out of the housing business altogether. It would

prefer to give poor families vouchers for rent money and let them find their own living quarters. Congress has resisted the idea but has approved a \$200 million demonstration program to provide vouchers for 15,000 housing units. Whatever is done to the programs, their cost cannot be reduced much in the near term; the government is stuck with paying \$9 billion a year to amortize \$250 billion worth of constructed subsidized housing, a sum that must be amortized over 30 years.

The program most widely associated with the idea of welfare is AFDC, which, for the most part, gives cash benefits to single mothers and their children. The state-set benefit levels vary drastically, with the federal government reimbursing the states for roughly half their cost, a total of \$7.5 billion this year. AFDC was cut back severely in 1981. The most significant change was to reduce the income an AFDC recipient can earn and still remain eligible for benefits. Even where the income is low enough to preserve eligibility, the combination of wages and federal payout may leave the recipient worse off than she had been, jobless, under prior law.

Other AFDC changes require the income of stepparents to be included in calculating gross family income and restrict recipients to \$1,000 in assets (after limited exclusions for housing and automobiles). According to the Health & Human Services Dept., these changes eliminated 408,000 families from the rolls and reduced benefits to 299,000 more.

Given this history, it is not surprising that few see much room for additional cuts. The Administration has proposed that requiring AFDC recipients capable of work to perform public service in exchange for their benefits—an option given to states in the last two years—be made mandatory, with a possible savings of \$171 million in 1985.

In addition, the Administration wants the power to withhold overdue child-support payments from the paychecks of absent fathers whose families collect welfare. But this would raise less than \$40 million. Large additional cuts are impossible because the primary beneficiaries of the program are children who have no other means of support. "We tend to focus too much attention on the adult recipient who ought to be out there working," says David P. Racine, director of government and social policy for the American Public Welfare Assn., which represents state welfare administrators.

LITTLE HELP

No such moral judgments color the debate over the government's other major cash support program, Supplemental Security Income. SSI is the program of last resort for the elderly, physically and mentally handicapped, and blind who have no other significant source of income. The program, which costs about \$4 billion a year, has such rigid qualification requirements and provides so low a level of support—the average monthly benefit per person is under \$100—that it was left largely untouched by the 1981 cuts. In fact, some benefits were increased last year. The only thing the Administration could find to propose for next year is reduction of SSI benefits to offset Social Security windfalls received by some beneficiaries. The proposal would save only \$5 million a year.

One striking feature of the current debate on welfare is an absence of the sweeping welfare reforms that were the darling of many economists, and indeed of the Nixon Administration in the early 1970s. The re-

jection of drastic reform stems from studies that have convinced budget experts that no savings could be made. They point, for example, to the experience with SSI, which was created in the 1970s out of an assortment of federal and state programs and wound up costing twice as much as the former tab for the individual programs. "The problem with consolidation is that no one can ever lose," says an OMB official. "Every time we have tried to consolidate benefits, we have ended up with a profound expansion of outlays."

Although some cuts are possible in all of the existing programs, the prospects for big savings to help reduce the deficit just are not there. Current programs are very close to the minimum level of support that a wealthy society has decided it must provide to its poorest citizens.●

PHILADELPHIA CLERGY COMMENTS ON STRUCTURAL UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to an extraordinary document recently issued by 132 Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant religious leaders in the Philadelphia area. Under the auspices of the Northwest Interfaith Movement, a representative group of these clergy spend 9 months preparing a paper entitled "Work and Justice." The final draft was released last month in pamphlet form; it is a powerful statement on the changing nature of the American economy and the effect of this change on working Americans, their families, and their communities.

The document notes the terrible personal effects of long-term unemployment and calls for a new covenant between business and the communities in which they are located. The goal of this effort is to make economic decisions with sensitivity to their impact on individuals. A most useful facet of the document is its enumeration of several positive developments on the employment front in the Philadelphia area, including the formation of community credit unions, business-government cooperative projects, and employee-owned businesses. This study represents an important step in the dialog we must maintain as our Nation enters a future of diminishing resources. Mr. Speaker, I commend "Work and Justice" to my colleagues, and ask that it be printed following my remarks.

WORK AND JUSTICE

There is a new unemployment that haunts our land. It is an unemployment that is unrelated to normal business cycles. Despite talk of economic recovery, it is an unemployment that is getting worse, not better.

Each of the last economic recoveries left behind a higher rate of joblessness. After the 1975 recession, unemployment reached a low point of 4 percent.¹ After the 1980 recession, unemployment never got below 6 percent.² And experts predict that the 1982 recession will leave behind an 8 percent unemployment rate.³ That's 10 million Americans left looking for work, and millions more too discouraged to look.

Without work people cannot maintain dignity. Without work people cannot maintain decency.

The prophet Micah said: "And what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with your God?"

Quoting the tradition of the prophets, Jesus dedicated his ministry to "bringing good news to the poor" and "liberty to the oppressed." Sharing a common value heritage we ask: what is required of us "to love justice" today? What does it mean "to bring good news to the poor" today?

As religious leaders, we hold firmly that the only sure basis for a healthy and productive society is to be found in the moral principal of fairness—the fair and just distribution of the burdens, benefits, and risks which derive from shared participation in our common life.

We sign our names to this document not because we believe it is a definitive statement of the problem but because by it we intend to begin a dialogue. In the tradition of the New England town meeting, we believe citizens concerned with our economic crisis—an enduring crisis of equity and justice—should, as the Bible says, "reason together."

THE HUMAN MEANING OF WORK

Work is more than an economic issue. It is a profound moral issue, an issue of justice and fairness. Who works and who does not, what kind of work is done, and who has the say—these are fundamental ethical questions. It is in and through work that men and women express their human essence, whether the work they do be the paid work of factory or the unpaid work of home, the work of the carpenter or the work of the composer. Through work men and women respond to their unique human calling to extend by human creativity the work of God begun in Creation. The opening pages of Genesis tell us that we are made "in the image of God" and that our mandate is to "be fruitful and multiply, fill the earth and subdue it."

In times past, "subduing the earth" meant the human conquest of nature. But no more. With new ecological awareness, we now realize that "subduing the earth" implies not conquest, but the use and care by God's creatures of God's creation. The earth is not something to be acted against, but something to be interacted with. Work is our species' special way of living within our natural environment.

Work is uniquely human. Only humans make the social and natural order an object of their reflection and activity. We are not limited by our given world, but we can transcend and transform it. In transforming the world we ourselves become transformed. The most graphic example of this can be found in our early evolution as a species. The opposed thumb, the expansion of the higher brain, and our increasingly elaborate use of tools all evolved simultaneously over

millions of years. The tool is profoundly symbolic of the human. Our working is our species' way of being and of becoming. This is the real meaning of God's command ("mitzvot") to "subdue" the earth.

Moreover, these creative possibilities inherent in work join us to the community of human workers. We remember with gratitude the heritage of prior human labor which, over time, by elaborating its use of tools and in increasingly complex ways organizing its productive activity, has sharply increased the possibilities of our own well-being.

Work, even work distorted by exploitation, reminds us that it is only in joining together with others that we improve that common good through which each benefits by the other's labor and without which all remain both alone and destitute. So it is that Paul warns us in his letter to the Romans, "as in one body we have many members, and all members do not have the same function," still each is "not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think with sober judgment."

In work we discover a profound and necessary mutuality. It is a distortion, therefore, to see fellow workers as competitors to be "beaten," or as impersonal entities in the productive process to be "planned." Indeed, by our working together we should be drawn out of our narrow self-preoccupation and excessive self-regard into the clarity of self-perception which sees our common human journey nourished by the creativity and sacrifice of those who labored before us. We should be reminded that we too are part of this journey—that our time is a part of all time, and that as inheritors we are also responsible to preserve and add to this legacy which is built up and made fruitful in human labor.

Work, then, is equally an ordinance of God and a gift which each human gives to every other human, and each generation gives to the next. Work is a mirror within which an era reveals its inner reality. As such, work remains at every stage of human development the surest entrance into the social question—the question of justice and exploitation in human relationships.

WORK TODAY

There is a crisis of work in our society today. There is a new unemployment and a new pattern of downwardly mobile re-employment whose causes are still very active. Yesterday's profits made in America too often become today's investment capital producing jobs in low wage, third world countries that replace jobs here at home. Or, increasingly, machines take the place of working men and women on the assembly line and in laboratories and offices, with little regard for job retraining or the future of displaced workers.

We have entered a new world economy where not only neighborhoods but whole domestic populations are held hostage, made to compete against one another under the discipline of maximizing profits, and where losers are left to joblessness or work that has lower wages and fewer benefits. True, the poverty of the world's masses requires worldwide economic development. But this development cannot rest upon increasing the social inequalities inside both first and third world societies. Today, whether in Brazil or in our own country, the poor get poorer and the rich get richer.

The result? Profits recover. Wall Street prospers. But working people and their neighborhoods continue in deep distress. Ac-

¹ Bureau of Labor Statistics.

² Ibid.

³ New York Times; May 1983; December 1983.

cepted social indicators do not register this discrepancy. Rising Dow Jones averages seem on the evening news record the flourishing of some but not the floundering of many.

There must be no mistake. Unemployment injures. In fact it kills. Research shows that for every 1 percent increase in sustained unemployment there will be an additional 37,000 deaths in our society. A 1 percent increase in unemployment means a 5 percent increase in suicides, a 7.5 percent increase in homicides among males between 17 and 24.¹ The nearly 50 percent unemployment rate amongst minority youth locks a whole generation out of the American Dream, condemning them, while still young, to live the rest of their lives in some twilight zone of worklessness and hopelessness.

Unemployment increases death by heart attack. It increases alcoholism, wife and child abuse, and divorce rates.² Unemployment attacks our neighborhoods, causing deterioration in social and physical environments, undermining the community's tax base, and so depriving it of the means to fight back. Added to this unemployment is an emerging pattern in our society that the new jobs which are created are lower on the wage and benefit scale. The service economy may be fine if you are a doctor or corporate lawyer, but most of the new work being generated in our society is in the fast food industry or in clerical and retail work. The average weekly wage for factory work in Southeastern Pennsylvania in December 1979 was \$295, while the average wage for service was \$170.³ This wage differential holds true all across the country.

The Catholic Bishops of Canada have spoken about this new crisis of work. "In effect, capital has become transnational and technology has become increasingly capital-intensive. The consequences are likely to be permanent or structural unemployment and increasing marginalization for a large segment of the population in Canada and other countries." The Bishops speak of this as "a deepening moral crisis," because "through these structural changes, 'capital' is reasserted as the dominant organizing principle of economic life."⁴

The Bishops then conclude: "This orientation directly contradicts the ethical principle that labour, not capital, must be given priority in the development of an economy based on justice." Many would disagree with the bishops. Many would defend the emerging patterns of capital formation and economic development as the only effective way of freeing capital, through increased incentives, to invest in new technology and additional physical capacity. This increased investment will lead to increased productivity and eventually to more jobs.

But we must ask: progress that is built upon high rates of unemployment, that downgrades the wages and work skills of millions of American workers, is progress for whom? Economic recovery for whom?

A NEW COVENANT

In Biblical times the tribes of Ancient Israel would gather periodically to renew their covenant with God and one another.

¹ Bluestone and Harrison, "The Deindustrialization of America," Basic Books, N.Y. 1982 (citing the research of Dr. M. Harvey Brenner, Epidemiologist, Johns Hopkins University).

² Ibid.

³ Philadelphia Inquirer, January 1980.

⁴ "Ethical Reflections on the Economic Crisis," The Episcopal Commission for Social Affairs, Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, January 1983.

Our own forebears covenanted together in establishing this country. Now, we today must seek a new covenant that will restore our sense of common purpose, of shared destiny, and return to its place of preeminence that common good without which no private benefit can long endure.

In 1630 John Winthrop, first governor of the colony at Massachusetts Bay, said as he sailed to America: "we must be knit together in this work as one man. We must be willing to abridge ourselves of our superfluities for the supply of others' necessities." But then he warned, echoing the words of Deuteronomy: There is now set before us life and good, death and evil, in that we are commanded this day to love the Lord our God, walk in His ways and to keep His laws and the articles of our covenant with him. * * * But if our hearts shall turn away so that we will not obey, but shall be seduced and worship other gods, our pleasures and profits, and serve them, it is propounded unto us this day, we shall surely perish out of the good land whither we pass over this vast sea to possess it."

Today we stand at a crucial turning point. We stand in need of national renewal. We have become a nation divided against itself. We have lost the moral basis for our common life. We "worship other gods."

Trying to fix personal blame or innocence is not helpful. The fault lies with a structure of decisionmaking which obscures the relationship between economic decisions and their human consequences. We keep two sets of books in our society—one called capital and the other called community. What counts as costs to community does not register on the books of capital; while profits to capital may in fact be at the expense of workers and their neighborhoods.

This was not supposed to happen. Classical free market theory taught us that if capital is simply left free to do whatever it wants then, automatically, the rest of us will also benefit. The relationship between capital and community, it was argued, need not be a covenanted relationship—because the operation of the free market will automatically transform the pursuit of individual self-interest into the public benefit of an efficient and growing economy.

As the theory explains: if society lets consumers pursue unhindered their own self-interest, and associates these with competing producers by way of the free market, the result will be not the expansion of greed, but products of high quality at the lowest possible price. Efficiency and productivity will become the twin deities of enterprise and lead us into the promised land of a rapidly expanding economy.

True, some will get more and others less, but all will have more than they had in the beginning. Economic growth promises to make unnecessary, therefore, the inherently conflictual task of deciding what is just and fair. Morality becomes a matter of one's personal and family life; while economic is turned over to technical expertise.

From the beginning of free market thought, a curtain of silence is thus drawn between capital, which calculates profits, and community, where human benefits and injuries are tallied. Simply let capital do what it is best at—pursuing efficiency and productivity—and the rest, in theory, will take care of itself.

We believe that the usefulness of this social philosophy—whatever it may have been in the past—has now ended. The new economic conditions of internationalized capital and labor markets, together with the

failure of political institutions, both national and international, to keep these economic forces under effective public discipline—requires moral analysis and corrective action based upon religious and moral principles.

We are faced with the same task our forebears faced: how to discern and defend our "commonwealth." Contradicting the Biblical commandment, "thou shalt not envy" ("lo tachmod bayt rayecha"), we have established a consumer society built upon greed. Personal worth is measured by our ability to consume or possess. The message transmitted by our mass media hundreds of times daily is: the more you buy, the happier you'll be. But the goal is illusory, the equation false. Experience bears out that time and again, whenever higher levels of consumer achievement are reached, self-doubt and anxiety remain the same or even increase.

And what about the poor in a consumption-oriented society like ours? The Bible clearly shows God's special concern for the poor, the widow, and children. Yet today, while the wealthy enjoy tax cuts, the poor suffer cutbacks in social services. Many of these are women who head households and struggle to maintain independence but remain in destitution. Of female-headed families with income from private pensions, annuities or alimony, 19 percent are in poverty. Of female-headed families which receive a wage or salary, fully 20 percent have income below the poverty level.⁵ God's warning to societies which feed greed even as they exploit women and ignore the cry of children is clear: That society stands condemned.

As a nation we stand in need of a new covenant, a renewed moral foundation. Capital and community must find a just and mutually agreed upon basis for their association. In seeking to define the terms of this new covenant, we may begin by stating clearly what is not fair or what is not just. It is not just, although it is true, that 60 percent of the tax benefits from recent tax cuts have gone to the 5 percent of American households making more than \$50,000 a year.⁶ It is not just that while the rich increase their wealth, the poor are faced with sharply reduced social programs for such basic necessities as food, housing, adequate medical care and warmth in winter.

It is not fair that young men and women must mortgage their futures to pay for a college education, when education is no longer a social luxury but a necessity for entry into a post-industrial job market. It is not fair that corporations can abandon a community with impunity to seek higher profits in low-wage third world countries. It is not fair that, unlike other Western industrialized nations, we have no systematic program for worker retraining but instead leave our displaced workers without help to find a secure job future.

We call for a new covenant—a conscious moral relationship between capital and community, between those who make significant economic decisions and those who must live with the consequences of those decisions. True, capital invests in community—producing jobs and income. But equally true, community invests in capital, supporting over time that crucial loyalty to the work ethic and belief in the future without

⁵ Congressional Budget Offices; Congressional Testimony, Spring 1982 (Congressional Record).

⁶ Ibid.

which the whole structure of incentive and social discipline breaks down.

Already there are signs of promise. We see the spirit of commonwealth emerging in a new managerial training and reward system which recognizes the importance of long-term commitment rather than an exaggerated preoccupation with short-term profits—commitment to the development of excellence of product, investment in research and long-term development programs, and a sense of responsibility to an established workforce which displays itself in constant job retraining and the intention of lifetime job security.

There are specific examples of a new covenant of justice emerging here in the Delaware Valley. We cite five of these.

1. We see signs of promise in corporations taking an active hand in improving the educational environment of our city school system. The strong relationship which Colonial Penn Insurance established with Vaux Junior High School stands as model for expanded corporate involvement in community welfare.

2. We see signs of renewed covenant in the emerging community-based credit unions, which link enterprise and neighborhood in a shared destiny. We believe that religious and secular organizations have an obligation to place a portion of their own endowment and pension funds in these creative ventures, which point backward to the Biblical idea of covenant and forward towards a restored commonwealth.

3. We note with satisfaction that a major corporation in our area—the Sun Company—when deciding to close its Sun Ship Yard, pledged \$3 million to the city of Chester for anticipated losses in wage taxes. This accountability to community needs to be duplicated and deepened all across our country. Indeed, it is an accountability which should be embedded in law.

4. We look with hope to the emergence of community/worker owned enterprise, which roots work in local neighborhoods. PACE (Philadelphia Association for Cooperative Enterprise) is an organization which assists these efforts at a new style of ownership. Thanks to the foresight and leadership of Local 1357 of the United Food and Commercial Workers, the shutdown of A&P stores in the Delaware Valley and the loss of over 2000 jobs was averted in 1981. In its stead, a new subsidiary of A&P was created, re-employing the over 2000 former A&P workers, and two worker-owned supermarkets (O&O) were created.

5. We applaud the sense of shared destiny shown in recent efforts to make mortgage money available to city residents at below-market rates by a creative investment policy of Philadelphia Pension Fund planners. The high rate of return to the Fund shows that community support is not just morally but also financially rewarding.

Finally, beyond these local signs of hope, we see the need for a new kind of federal legislation, legislation which brings capital and community into the same set of books. We need to structure by federal law the process of economic decision-making so as to assure that the wealth which results from our common efforts will benefit the many and not just the few, will sustain and restore neighborhoods and provide jobs, for all who want to work, that are secure and pay a decent wage. This and this alone is the definition of a healthy economy.

In the end our wealth is our commonwealth. The truth which Martin Luther King, Jr. spoke still stands: "we are caught

in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. What affects one directly, affects all indirectly." the pursuit of private profit may succeed for a while but, if undisciplined to the common good, ultimately will destroy its own foundation. Community alone is the rock upon which capital can establish a secure future. All else, as the Bible indicates, is sand, and will be washed away in the flood of time.

The choice is ours. Lincoln's vision of "a nation of the people, by the people, for the people," has yet to be realized. Our Constitution begins, "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union . . ." and today we are again called to that task. We would "preach good news to the poor", "set at liberty those who are oppressed", and "let justice roll down like mighty waters." This task is the meaning of human life and the way in which human life finds meaning. It is God's call to covenant. ●

HEALTH CARE TECHNOLOGY

HON. EDWARD R. MADIGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to join my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), in the recent introduction of legislation which provides specific authority for the National Center of Health Services Research to undertake research on health-care technology and to advise the Secretary of Health and Human Services whether specific medical technologies should be reimbursable under federally financed programs. In addition, this legislation gives the Secretary of Health and Human Services the discretion to participate in a private, nonprofit entity which could provide additional and broader technology assessment tasks to include clearinghouse functions, the stimulation, coordination, and commission of assessments and the identification of specific medical technologies for assessment.

Rising health-care costs are a concern to all of us. The remarkable advances in the development of medical technology have helped us maintain our preeminent position as world leaders in medical care. But with that preeminence comes a harsh reality—at least 25 percent of the measured costs in health care are due to the use of new technology that may not have been carefully assessed with respect to costs and benefits.

I join with my distinguished colleague in emphasizing the need to maintain quality and access to the fruits of our technology research. Health-care providers and third-party payors need to have the best information available in order to spend health-care dollars wisely and efficiently. What is now lacking is a coordinated, broadly based, scientific approach to medical-technology assessment.

Our legislation provides a framework for not only assessing new technology, but for reviewing the appropriate use of technology that may be obsolete. Decisions to pay for costly technology must be based not only on costs but also on effectiveness, safety, and the level of benefits.

The best joint efforts of industry, health professionals, and the Federal Government are needed to address technology-assessment issues. This legislation provides for a joint private-public consortium to address broader technology assessment issues and for needed activities in the Public Health Service to assist the Secretary of Health and Human Services in making coverage decisions under medicare and other federally financed programs. These functions are desperately needed to maintain the quality of our medical care and to judiciously manage health-care costs. ●

BAYONNE CHAPTER OF NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS SALUTES THREE COMMUNITY LEADERS

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, three outstanding individuals from the city of Bayonne are being honored by that community's chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, as recipients of the 1984 annual medalion awards.

Ceremonies will take place during the organization's annual dinner dance to be held on Tuesday, May 1, 1984, at 6 p.m. at the Hi-Hat in Bayonne, NJ.

The medallions are awarded to representatives of the Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic religious faiths "who have best promoted the spirit of brotherhood in the community." Those to be honored are Solomon Z. Mangel, Patrick C. Schifano, and Thomas K. Wojlawowicz.

I extend congratulations to the three recipients and also to the organization for acknowledging the outstanding work of these men who teach and live and work at brotherhood every day in the week. The individual best known to me, Thomas K. Wojlawowicz, was born and raised in Bayonne. He is a graduate of Mount Carmel Elementary School, Saint Anthony of Padua Prep School, and Seton Hall University, where he obtained a B.S. degree in education. Following this, he did graduate work in aquatics at the University of Alabama.

The honoree is employed by the Bayonne Board of Education, teaching at Bayonne High School and Lincoln Community School. In addition to his

teaching duties he directs both the community and school programs, having served in these capacities for 11 and 20 years respectively.

Wojslawowicz is vice president of the National Inter-Scholastic Swimming Coaches Association, for which he wrote and developed their widely used swimming manual.

A member of the Polish American Congress, he serves as president of the Bayonne Chapter, vice president of the State chapter and is a director of the national chapter. He is president of the Polish American Citizens Club, a board member of the Polish American Home, executive vice president of the General Pulaski Memorial Committee, and chairman of the High School Girls Swimming Committee. Among his other affiliations are memberships in the Richard Rutkowski Association, the Knights of Columbus, and the Mount Camel Lyceum.

Wojslawowicz has organized and coached the Bayonne YMCA Mermaid and Starfish swim programs for the past 20 years. He planned and designed the widely used Lincoln School pool, where he established a senior citizens swim program. In addition, he organized a rally in support of Solidarity against Martial Law in Poland, ran fund-raising youth dances for the Cancer Fund, collected food, medicine, and clothing for the people of Poland, and is currently working on the Restoration of the Statue of Liberty Committee. He currently serves as chairman of the Bayonne Housing Authority.

Previous honors which have been bestowed on him include the Service to Youth Medal by the YMCA, where he also received the International Service Award for conducting swim clinics in Trinidad and Tobago. He was inducted in the Bayonne Sport Hall of Fame for his contributions to swimming and was named "Swim Coach of the Year" by the New Jersey Swim Coaches Association. In 1970 the Bayonne Junior Chamber of Commerce gave him their Outstanding Young Man of the Year Award. The same year he was the Bayonne marshall of the New York Pulaski Day parade.

Thomas' involvement indeed echoes the words of David Grayson who wrote:

To be needed in other human lives—is there anything greater or more beautiful in this world.

It is also my pleasure to pay tribute to Solomon Z. Mangel and Patrick C. Schifano, the other two recipients of this coveted award.

Mangel, born in New York, after his graduation from the City University of New York and Baruch College of Business, married Lillian Epstein and moved to Bayonne, where they have raised their two daughters, Florence Ellen and Phyllis.

Since arriving in Bayonne, Mangel has been actively involved in the community.

Currently serving as the president of the Bayonne Chamber of Commerce and Tax Research Council, Mangel is also secretary of the Bayonne Plumbing Supply Co. and treasurer of the Jersey Jobbers Group, an association of plumbing supply wholesalers in New Jersey.

A member of Temple Emanu-el, he also serves as a director on its board of trustees.

In addition, Mangel is a trustee with the board of directors of the Jewish Hospital and Rehabilitation Center in Jersey City and cochairman of the corporate gifts division, endowment sustaining fund for the Bayonne Jewish Community Center.

Mangel has also held a number of other positions over the years, including president of the Jewish Community Council of Bayonne, president of the Bayonne District, Zionist Organization of America, president of the Brotherhood of Temple Emanu-el, chairman of the United Jewish Appeal of Bayonne, cochairman of Bonds for Israel in the city and trustee on the board of directors of the Bayonne Jewish Community Center.

Receiving the NCCJ's medallion award has become a tradition in the Mangel family.

Four other family members have also been selected as honorees, including Sidney Epstein, Mangel's father-in-law, Marvin Epstein, his brother-in-law, and cousins Nathan and Lillian Susskind.

Mangel has indeed given much of his talents back to the community. He is a member of the Alpha Delta Sigma, the national honorary advertising fraternity, and to Beta Gamma Sigma, the national honorary scholastic fraternity in the business field.

High points in this college career were his graduation cum laude with the degree of bachelor of business administration and being awarded the Wollman Prize for his thesis, "The National Theater Movement."

Also to be honored is Patrick C. Schifano, born in Jersey City, who is a graduate of Jersey City State College where he earned B.A. and M.A. degrees in English.

After teaching at the Bergen School and Teaneck Junior High School, he received a professional diploma in linguistics from Columbia University. Further on in his career he worked with the Society of Maladjusted Students in the New York City school system. He later conducted classes in the English language to the foreign-born personnel of Roosevelt High School. Schifano also taught at St. Peter's College, Kean College, and Princeton University, where he was live-in instructor for visiting Soviet and Eastern European Scientists par-

ticipating in a 2-year exchange program with U.S. scientists.

In 1971, he joined the Bayonne school system where he was subsequently appointed director of elementary language arts, overseeing programs in speech and English as a second language in addition to district programs.

The honoree is a member of Phi Delta Kappa, Public School Administrators Association, National Council of Teachers of English, National Association of Bilingual Educators, and the Hudson County Reading Association.

He is a past member of the Bayonne Bergen Temple Lodge No. 99 F&AM, past president of the New Jersey Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, past president of the Past Masters Association of Hudson County and secretary to the board of directors of the Bayonne Masonic Temple Association.

Schifano is also a member of the New Frontier Democrats of Bayonne, Concerned Citizens of Bayonne, and the Valley of Northern New Jersey A.A.S.R. He served as a judge for the Jersey Journal spelling contest, Rotary Club scholarship, essay contests, and the Vocational and Industrial Clubs of America.

He is married to the former Patricia Petrovich.

The work of these three men and the National Conference of Christians and Jews reminds me of the tremendous challenge of Franklin Delano Roosevelt who said:

If civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together, in the same world at peace.

I am also reminded of the words of a Hudson County older American who told me:

Let's remember that it takes both the white and black keys of the piano to play "The Star-Spangled Banner."

I believe the words of Peter E. Terzick, whose message "What is Brotherhood" to be most meaningful:

What is brotherhood? It is the wisdom of Lincoln and the warmth of Gandhi. It is the humility of Jesus, the humbleness of Mohammed, and the humanitarianism of Confucius. It is Catholic and Protestant and Jew living together in peacefulness and harmony. It is Italian and Dane and Bulgarian and Pole working side by side on the job and sitting shoulder to shoulder in the union hall searching for ways to advance the common good. It is the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount. It is the Bible, the Talmud, and the Koran. It is the essence of all wisdom of all the ages distilled into a single word. But equally it is the understanding of neighbors and friends who sorrow at your misfortunes and rejoice at your triumphs. You cannot see brotherhood; neither can you hear it nor taste it. But you can feel it a hundred times a day. It is the pat on the back when things look gloomy. It is the smile of encouragement when the way seems hard. It is the helping hand when the burden becomes unbearable.

Each day all of us must work for brotherhood because the responsibility of tolerance lies with those who have the wider vision so necessary to fight the evils of bigotry so graphically portrayed by Daniel O'Connell who wrote:

Bigotry has no head and can not think, no heart and can not feel. When she moves it is in wrath; when she pauses it is amid ruin. Her prayers are curses, her God is a demon, her communion is death; her vengeance is eternity, her decalogue written in the blood of her victims, and if she stops for a moment in her infernal flight it is upon a kindred rock to whet her vulture fang for a more sanguinary desolation.

I am sure that my colleagues here today in the House of Representatives wish to join me in this salute to Thomas K. Wojslawowicz, Solomon Z. Mangel, and Patrick C. Schifano. They will be presented their medallions by William Kowalski, Richard J. Malanowski, and Charles Mangel, who will make the presentation to his brother Solomon.●

REMARKS BY JACKIE PRESSER
AT THE AMERICA WORKS
WHEN AMERICA WORKS CON-
FERENCE

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an excellent speech by Jackie Presser before the America Works When America Works Conference on February 8, 1984. Mr. Presser is General President of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, representing 1.8 million members. He is a native of Ohio and was responsible for great innovation and growth in the Ohio Teamsters. It is with great pleasure that I submit his remarks today.

REMARKS BY JACKIE PRESSER

It is certainly an honor and a pleasure to have the opportunity to address such a distinguished audience. The theme of your conference couldn't be more welcome or timely. Far too often, those of us in labor, management and government get caught up in the grind of day-to-day details and risk missing the forest for the trees.

As I have stated repeatedly since becoming General President of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, it is time to break with the past, time to develop a new American partnership that can lead this nation into a progressive new direction that benefits the individual working man and woman and the economic system as a whole.

The many weighty questions that confront the labor relations community in America—bankruptcies, layoffs, trade deficits, productivity and technological innovation—boil down to the single issue of job security. By job security, I'm talking about more than just the retention and creation of jobs today, I'm talking about the adaptation of business, labor and government to the demands of the future.

Ladies and gentlemen, that future is staring us directly in the face and the prospect is not a happy one.

We pat ourselves on the back when only 8.0% of the labor force is out of work. We might not be so complacent if we look a bit further. Youth unemployment, a social and cultural timebomb, stands at 20%. Among minorities, it is 29%. And unemployment among black teenagers is a shameful 50%.

The fact is, America is not working.

We can appreciate the magnitude of the challenge that lies before us by a quick glance at the past. My union is a little over 80 years old.

Eighty years ago, nearly half of America's workers were farmers. Today, 4% are in farming. Eighty years ago, the steel industry was an infant, and the automobile industry not yet born. Computer technology lay a full two generations in the future.

The transformation of our workforce, the movement of our people and the improvement in their skills and standards of living since then have been staggering. Just imagine the changes in American society an 80 year old man or woman has witnessed in his or her life.

And yet, hard as it may be to comprehend, the changes of the final years of this century will likely surpass those of the last 80. And if that projection doesn't put the fear of God into you, you're either asleep or dead.

It means that all the displacements, all the technological innovations of 80 years will be compressed into 16.

Look at what has happened in just the first three years of this decade:

There are one-third fewer auto workers today than there were in 1980;

For the first time in our history, more than one-half of the workforce is female;

Home computer sales have topped \$1 billion in sales;

A generation of school children has grown dependent on calculators and video games; and

In business circles, teleconferencing and fully automated offices are no longer novelties.

These changes will only occur more rapidly and on a larger scale in the years ahead. As they do, they will totally reshape the American economy.

The question is . . . can the three major economic institutions—labor, management and government—keep pace with this change in order to improve employment opportunities for the people of this nation?

I don't know the answer to that question, but I do know this—if we don't, America will not have much of a future, and we will have squandered the glorious inheritance our forefathers left to us.

I know one other thing as well—we won't be able to do it unless we end the time-honored adversarial approach to our problems and join together to formulate joint strategies and policies to address the employment crisis.

I have been in the labor movement all my life, and I have witnessed first-hand the evolution of labor-management relations in this country. I well remember the early days of deep distrust and mutual threats. I rose through the labor ranks during the so-called "golden years" when America's postwar economic boom calmed fears and reduced strife. And finally, I have watched in recent years, as first, inflation, and then recession, rekindled the distrust and anger of those early years and threatened to rip the fabric of stable labor-management relations.

We can all take heart in the recent economic upswing, but we should not be blinded to the fact that the real employment crisis has little to do with the recent recession. The problem is structural.

Of course, economic growth, if we can sustain it, will expand employment opportunities. But that will not be enough. We need an employment policy that will make sure that our workers can fill the job openings that that growth will create.

The sad fact of life is that we have millions of laid-off workers whose jobs are likely never to return.

How do you tell the steelworker, the auto worker, the truck driver that the mill, the factory, the truck terminal is closed forever? And how does he tell his son who's always wanted to follow in his father's footsteps?

As a union leader who talks with other union leaders, I see and hear that everyday. The worker, in his frustration, blames his union. We blame management. And management blames the government. And all that finger-pointing accomplishes absolutely nothing.

The solution is not just avoiding recessions. It is not just extending unemployment benefits. It is not just enacting protectionist laws.

We need an employment policy that emphasizes prevention of unemployment rather than one designed merely to soften its impact. We need a plan that not only offers remedies for today, but hope for tomorrow. We need a program that anticipates displacement, not one that reacts to it. And we need to put job security on the same level of priority as national security.

We can't do it with the tools of the past. Unless we develop a mechanism that allows us to adapt to the circumstances facing us and develop a vehicle for adjusting these concerns in a mutually satisfactory manner, we will be condemning ourselves and our children to life in a second-rate nation.

In my opening remarks, I referred to the possibility of a new American partnership between labor, management and government. It is time to make that possibility a reality.

I have proposed the establishment of a tripartite policy-making body that would meet on a regular basis to develop long-range plans for labor relations in America. I am not talking about just another paperwork commission. I'm talking about a committee, comprised of labor, management and government officials, that would have broad authority over employment and training programs.

The need for a new structure is obvious at a time when, just in Congress alone, eight committees must deal with even minor changes in the unemployment insurance law. While they're deciding jurisdiction over problems, the problems have been getting larger.

I genuinely believe that such a tripartite body could get this country moving again. The experiment of labor-management cooperation committees has worked and continues to this day. Why not add the third integral partner in the labor relations system in America and start to get things done on a large scale, as we have on a small scale, in the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982.

I have no doubt that carrying out a comprehensive attack on the employment crisis will be very difficult. But winning the right to collective bargaining in the 30's was no picnic either. At the time that legislation was passed, many forecasters predicted doom for the American economy. Instead,

the collective bargaining process brought dignity and hope to the American worker and markets and opportunities to American industry.

It is time for another "labor revolution," one based on courage, cooperation and concern for the future. There's no turning the clock back. We're engaged, and must compete, in a global economy. The industrialization of newly developed countries will continue, as will technological progress.

The important point is that we are all in this together. Unions, management and government must all be concerned with how to make enterprises more effective and efficient, and how to best make use of our manpower.

As the spokesman for the largest trade union in the free world, I welcome that challenge and I urge you to join me in helping to shape a future in which the American family has the opportunity to make tomorrow better than today. Let's remember the words of the wise philosopher who wrote, "the essential things in life are the things we hold in common, not the things we hold separately."

Thank you. ●

THE IRANIAN TERRORIST THREAT

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to share this excellent article with my colleagues in the House. I believe that all of us in this Congress and all Americans are united in our disdain for international terrorism. State-supported transnational terrorism is a threat to civilized societies around the world.

Recent U.S. Government studies of terrorist incidents overseas and intelligence information reveal the hand of Khomeini behind many of these operations. The horrible destruction of the American Embassy in Beirut and the brutal terrorist attack on the marine headquarters in that city are but a few of the many terrorist attacks on U.S. interests, both in the Middle East and in other areas of the world.

In the past few months, an American Foreign Service officer, posted in France, was shot and badly wounded and a political officer at our Embassy in Beirut was kidnapped. In Turkey, an American military man assigned to that country was also shot and wounded by terrorists. The terrible assassination of Mr. Leamon R. Hunt, a former Foreign Service officer, and Director General of the Multinational Force and Observers headquartered in Rome, was a great loss and a real tragedy.

Although Iranian involvement in some of these terrorist attacks has been proven beyond any doubt, I strongly believe that Iranian complicity in all of these terrorist attacks will definitely be revealed in the near future. The ayatollah recently made it

perfectly clear that he would continue to attack and undermine American interests around the world.

Given the nature of this threat and the potentially grave damage that could be inflicted on our diplomatic, military, and business interests overseas by Iranian fanatics, we must take immediate action to counter this growing threat. I agree with our Secretary of State's recent comments suggesting that our Government take reprisals in the event of future Iranian terrorist action against U.S. interests. Enhancing American Embassy and military facility security around the world is a key aspect of our Nation's efforts to protect our diplomats and servicemen overseas against this mindless terrorism.

With these concerns in mind, I strongly recommend this fine editorial to my friends in the Congress. The concerns expressed in this editorial are, I believe, shared by all of us in the Congress. The fundamentalist terrorist madness of Iran must stop.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 2, 1984]

NEW DANGER FROM IRAN

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

A shift by Iran away from the target of closing the Persian Gulf's vital oil traffic to a more ominous objective—ideological and political subversion against U.S. interests everywhere—is under overtime study by Reagan administration policy makers.

Iran's aggression against Iraq is expected to culminate in the next few weeks in the region just north of Iraq's Persian Gulf city of Basra. The Iranian offensive is now perceived as more chilling to American interests than any other single event in the Middle East since World War II.

Swept under the rug the past two years by policy makers during their long distractions over successive Lebanon disasters, the brutal war of Iran against Iraq has now come in for some ugly second thoughts.

The initial findings of the new study: The Ayatollah Khomeini's principal interest may not be denial of oil to Japan and the West by blockading the Gulf. Instead, the ayatollah bargains on quick anti-U.S. flip-flops by the rich and vulnerable Persian Gulf oil states. His real objective is to run the United States out of the Moslem Middle East and extend the reach of his fanatical brand of Islamic fundamentalism to the Mediterranean.

One tentative U.S. decision has been made. If Iran is found to be the source of a new terrorist attack anywhere against the United States, the reprisal will be immediate and massive. That was not the American response last October to the Iranian-inspired Beirut airport attack that killed more than 200 Marines.

Top-level policy makers cannot be absolutely certain of the ayatollah's objectives. But the reappraisal, substituting political subversion over blockading the Strait of Hormuz, has its counterpart in Israel.

With Defense Minister Moshe Arens taking the lead, Israel's conservative government now realizes that Iran, not Iraq, is the real enemy in the Gulf war. Israel, partly because of earlier American pressure, is no longer secretly arming the ayatollah's men to defeat Iraq. Bloody experience in dealing with Iranian-style terror in its occupation of

southern Lebanon has opened Israel's eyes to what might ensue if the ayatollah cracks the Iraqi defense line north of Basra and sets up an Islamic republic in southern Iraq.

Odds are about 50-50 that this will indeed happen, perhaps within the next three weeks. The Reagan administration has reached a strong consensus about what would occur if Iran captures Basra and moves its forces to the Kuwait border. "Pre-emptive accommodation," in the phrase of one official, by a terrified Kuwait government that has already been terrorized by pro-Iranian Shiite fundamentalists.

This political accommodation would quickly spread down the gulf to encompass Saudi Arabia, the impotent oil sheikdoms and the two Yemens.

Brutal harassment of Americans, not expecting murder, would follow. There are some 70,000 Americans in the key, pro-U.S. Arab state of Saudi Arabia. "They would be reduced fast by coming home," one policy insider told us. Effective U.S. response would be impossible to this sort of ideological-political aggression, unlike the planned and credible military response if the ayatollah tried to close the Strait of Hormuz to oil tankers.

Shifting Iran's objective from the military to the political poses a frightening dilemma for the United States. A military move against Western shipping interests would be visible and tangible, easy to deal with by superior force. An Iranian offensive that is ideological and political, built on military conquest in Iraq, would be intangible and hard to pinpoint.

That explains the tentative decision to employ massive reprisal force—preferably directly against Iran itself—in case of a new terrorist attack on a U.S. Embassy or Americans anywhere that is clearly directed from Tehran.

Sure signs of anti-American terror have been discovered recently as far from the Persian Gulf as Manila and Bangkok. Pro-Khomeini extremists are escalating their threats against the United States wherever Islamic regimes hold power or Moslems have large minorities. The objective is not in doubt: expulsion of American influence by exploiting indigenous political power in Islamic states that are unable to resist the ayatollah's demands; direct use of Iranian-trained terrorists to undermine American influence.

Because the threat is unprecedented, the Iranian campaign against Iraq's defense of Basra is assuming the rare importance of a latter-day Battle of Thermopylae. Compared to the flawed Reagan administration performance on the localized Arab-Israeli struggle, the ayatollah's new challenge is one that the United States dare not lose if it wishes to remain the leader of the West. ●

THE MIRAGE OF SPACE DEFENSE

HON. MATTHEW F. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the House of Representatives adopted a budget that would require major reductions in defense and non-defense spending in the future. In both areas, we would be faced with dif-

ficult choices as to where those reductions should be made.

With regard to defense spending, my hope is that our colleagues will focus much closer attention on the Reagan administration's proposals for space-based weapons systems. This is one area of the defense budget where future costs are going to escalate rapidly and dramatically. However, as a recent editorial in the *New York Times* made clear, there are serious scientific questions regarding the feasibility of a space-based defense system. Moreover, as an accompanying article made clear, moving ahead with some of these efforts, such as modification of the Patriot missile system, could undermine the 1972 antiballistic missile treaty.

In short, space is one area where the United States ought to be moving with caution. Unless we do so, we may simply succeed in moving the arms race into outer space, at extraordinary cost to the American taxpayer. For the benefit of those of our colleagues who may not have seen the articles to which I referred, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting copies into the *RECORD* at this point.

The articles follow:

[From the *New York Times*, Apr. 2, 1984]

THE MIRAGE OF SPACE DEFENSE

In his "Star Wars" speech a year ago, President Reagan challenged scientists and engineers to design a space-based defense against Soviet missiles to "give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons obsolete." An expert panel has now given a forceful response: For the foreseeable future, a total shield is technologically impossible.

A defense against strategic missiles has been sought for years. If there was any practical basis for Mr. Reagan's exhortation, it lay in new technical ideas—the X-ray laser developed under Edward Teller's auspices at Livermore or the ground-based excimer laser advocated by George Keyworth, a Teller protege who is Mr. Reagan's science adviser.

Mr. Teller is often given credit for developing America's hydrogen bomb, but others, like Hans Bethe and Richard Garwin, also played important parts. Mr. Bethe and Mr. Garwin led the opposition to the antiballistic missile in the late 1960's. Now, as members of a Union of Concerned Scientists panel, they express vigorous skepticism about the X-ray laser and other aspects of the proposed defenses.

The X-ray laser is a one-shot device powered by a nuclear explosion. Its beam would shoot 2,500 miles across space and hit Soviet missiles before the warheads—and easily deployed decoys—separate from their booster rocket.

The scientists' panel points to a fatal flaw: Boosters can be redesigned to part from their payload low in the atmosphere, beyond the reach of the most powerful X-ray beam. Other lasers could, in theory, penetrate the atmosphere enough to damage a booster by heating its skin. But they would be effective only if the Russians neglected simple countermeasures, like spinning the booster to prevent the laser from burning a hole, or hiding its tell-tale flame with heat shields.

Destroying missiles in the booster phase is by far the best strategy for the defense. Only after reentry into the atmosphere sorts out the decoys is defense again feasible. At that late stage, some protection could be given to missile silos, but not to cities vulnerable to nuclear bursts at high altitude.

The science panel found that all conceivable defense weapons, from particle beams to the homing device used in America's antisatellite missile, have grave if not insuperable defects for a Star Wars system. So do platforms from which such weapons might be launched or directed. Platforms in space are sitting targets, and the gigantic mirrors needed to direct laser beams would be especially vulnerable. To cover Soviet silos round the clock would require hundreds of platforms. Just to lift their laser fuel into space would cost \$70 billion.

Computer speed is another problem. It is unlikely that any software now conceivable could work fast enough to manage an anti-missile battle. Since even minor holes in any defense would risk millions of deaths, no system is worth having unless it works almost perfectly. And since it could never be fully tested, perfection is unattainable.

Secretary Weinberger says he has no doubt that a "reliable and effective defense" will one day be possible. Other Pentagon officials have told Congress that the Star Wars program is designed only to develop technology and that no deployment decisions will be taken before 1990.

But a decision can be taken right now. It's worth spending something, but surely not \$25 billion, on Star Wars research. Short of some giant new stride in technology, the old answer remains as cogent as ever: Defense is destabilizing. It stimulates the opposing side to develop offenses that will defeat it, and offers a premium to the side that strikes first. As far ahead as anyone can see, the most effective protection is agreement with the Soviet Union to limit the nature and quantity of nuclear forces.

[From the *New York Times*, Apr. 2, 1984]

MISSILE SYSTEM CHANGE SEEN AS THREAT TO TREATY

(By Wayne Biddle)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—After two decades of development to be the Army's frontline anti-aircraft weapon, the Patriot missile system is being transformed to be able to shoot down Soviet missiles, according to Defense Department officials.

Some arms control specialists say they fear an advanced Patriot missile could undermine the 1972 treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union limiting anti-missile systems. Defense Department officials have said the Soviet Union's SA-12 mobile air-defense missile, which an Army spokesman said was similar to the Patriot, may already violate the treaty.

The Army is looking at a wide range of missions for the Patriot, including shooting at missiles, said Brig. Gen. James C. Cerce, the Army's deputy director of combat support systems.

THREAT TO TREATY

"Large-scale deployment of a Patriot with antimissile capabilities would almost certainly destroy the treaty," said Albert Carnesale, professor of public policy at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard. He was in the American delegation that negotiated the treaty on the so-called antiballistic missiles, considered one of the

most effective arms control agreements of the 1970's.

John B. Rhinelander, a Washington lawyer who was a legal adviser to the delegation that worked on the first treaty limiting strategic arms, said, "This is another example of where technological change is eating at the edges of the ABM treaty."

An Army spokesman said the service had discussed the treaty issues involving an anti-missile Patriot with the State Department and the Office of the Secretary of Defense but would not elaborate.

A Patriot combat unit consists of a portable radar antenna for finding and following targets, a computer for controlling the radar and the missile, an electric power generator and eight launchers carrying four missiles each. All these components are mounted on trucks. The Patriot, meant to replace obsolete Nike-Hercules anti-aircraft stations in Europe, can carry nuclear warheads, but all units scheduled for deployment in Western Europe will be nonnuclear.

The Army says it hopes to buy 103 Patriot units and about 6,000 missiles at an estimated cost of \$11 billion. For the current fiscal year, Congress approved production of 12 units and 287 missiles at a total of \$845 million. The Army is taking delivery on Patriots ordered in 1981 from the Raytheon Company and its major subcontractor, the Martin Marietta Corporation.

Although Congress authorized limited production of the missile system in 1980, problems have kept manufacturing down ever since. According to a 1983 review of the program by the General Accounting Office, an investigative arm of Congress, the Patriot "was still showing a low reliability and experiencing performance problems" in 1980.

DEPLOYING BEHIND SCHEDULE

An Army spokesman said testing was halted when problems developed last year after the Patriot and soldiers trained to operate it were brought together for the first time. Testing is to resume in the fall.

The first Patriot units were to be sent to American forces in Europe in October, but an Army spokesman said the plan was at least half a year behind schedule. American and West German officials are working out the details of an agreement reached in December to place 24 Patriot systems with North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces along the East German border.

Mr. Carnesdale said that although development of a weapon that could shoot down "tactical" missiles was permitted by the 1972 treaty, which applies specifically to "strategic" weapons, such a weapon system cannot be used or tested against strategic missiles.

But the practical difference between "short-range" tactical and "long-range" strategic weapons was never defined. "Tactical" characterizes weapons of shorter range used in a region where combat is occurring. "Strategic" refers to weapons of longer, even intercontinental range. The American Pershings and Soviet SS-20 missiles fall somewhere in the middle because they can be launched several hundred miles from their targets. General Cerce refused to comment which Soviet missiles the Patriot would be enabled to shoot down.

EFFECTIVENESS IS QUESTIONED

"There is a large technical divide between anti-aircraft and anti-tactical-missile systems," said Ashton B. Carter, a research fellow at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and editor of a recent study of

missile defense published by the Brookings Institution. "But the divide between antitactical and anti-ICBM is smaller," he said, referring to large, intercontinental ballistic missiles that universally considered to be of a strategic nature. "Once you've declared an antitactical system, you've made the big leap."

William E. Jackson, Jr., a senior fellow at the University of Arkansas's Fulbright Institute of International Relations and a former executive director of the General Advisory Committee on Arms Control, said, "Would defense against a 500-mile range submarine-launched missile be allowed under the treaty? I do not think so. Would defense against a 500-mile range land-based ballistic missile be allowed? I doubt it."

NEW ARMY PROGRAM

In 1983 the Army started a new development program, Anti-Tactical Missile, that, according to testimony before Congressional panels, depends on using the Patriot system. Although General Cerce refused to comment in detail about how Patriot would be improved under this program, an Army spokesman said "actual missile test firings" would validate the advanced system. He also said any changes to Patriot's radar, a crucial element for antimissile capability, would primarily involve computer control.

For the Patriot system to defend against tactical missiles, Congress appropriated \$10 million for 1983, \$17 million for the current fiscal year, and is being asked for \$92 million in the fiscal year 1985. About \$190 million is already budgeted for Patriot research, development and testing over the same period. An Army spokesman said spending of about \$28 million was planned in 1987 for initial procurement of the antitactical system.

Congressional testimony has indicated that this system could eventually include a vast network of surveillance satellites and airborne radar systems.●

LOUISVILLE AREA TEACHER RECEIVES U.S. TEACHER OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the distinguished dean of the Kentucky delegation and chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, CARL PERKINS, as my guest on my television show.

On the show, Mr. PERKINS and I discussed the need for a continued strong Federal role to assure that a quality education is available to all Americans. We also discussed several bills before the House—including the American Defense Education Act, H.R. 881, which we have both sponsored—to help maintain our standard of excellence in American education.

Nowhere is that standard of excellence more evident than in room 211 in Ballard High School in Jefferson County, KY, where Sherleen Strong Sisney teaches economics and history. Sherleen has just been designated the U.S. Teacher of the Year by Encyclo-

pedia Britannica, the Chief State School Officers Organization, and Good Housekeeping magazine.

I have had the pleasure and honor of speaking before Sherleen's classes at Ballard on several occasions. The questions her students ask, and the observations they deliver about the political process evidence a depth and breadth of knowledge that attests to the quality of their instructional leader.

I had the pleasure of meeting with Sherleen, her husband Lee, her proud parents, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Strong, as well as three of her students from Ballard High School—who were all here to participate in ceremonies in her honor at the White House. Sherleen has brought credit and honor to the Commonwealth of Kentucky. We are all proud to have her kind in our midst.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the April 1, Louisville Courier Journal about the exceptional work Mrs. Sisney is doing in the classroom.

The article follows:

LOUISVILLIAN HONORED AS U.S. TEACHER OF THE YEAR

(By Leslie Ellis)

One of the country's highest education honors has come to Kentucky with the naming of Sherleen Sisney, economics and history teacher at Ballard High School, as the national Teacher of the Year.

She will receive the award from President Reagan in a ceremony in the White House Rose Garden on April 11.

Thirty of her students, local school officials and her immediate family are invited to join her for the ceremony.

During a five-day stay in Washington, she will be featured in television appearances, interviews with the national media, meetings with top education officials and presentations to teacher associations.

She will continue in the national spotlight for the next year—her predecessor had at least three speaking engagements a week.

The award is expected to give Kentucky education some positive publicity—a departure from the usual dour reports that rank Kentucky among the bottom states in teacher salaries, literacy rates, dropout rates and spending per pupil.

"I'm still really in shock," Mrs. Sisney said Friday afternoon. "I've been trying to be a teacher and also work on press releases," she said, chuckling over having to juggle the demands of her new role.

Her students had left for the afternoon; her classroom—Room 211, at end of the hall—was abnormally quiet. Visitors usually find students operating mock corporations, debating political issues, acting as historical figures or writing new constitutions.

Named Kentucky's Teacher of the Year last fall, Mrs. Sisney is already a nationally recognized leader in involving the business community in the classroom. She created a "learn-by-doing" economics curriculum that has earned her an avid following among students.

The philosophy behind her teaching is to give students a reason to learn, to excite them about learning, and to encourage

them to analyze and to ask good questions, instead of simply memorizing facts.

"She forces us to strive to find information on your own. She just doesn't spoon-feed us," a student in one of her economics classes said earlier this year.

A sign over her chalkboard says "Be More Specific," an admonition she uses to encourage students to speak and write clearly. Quizzes often follow reading assignments to test students' understanding of the material, and she may ask students to redo written work several times.

The National Teacher of the Year award has three sponsors: Encyclopedia Britannica, the Chief State School Officers organization, and Good Housekeeping magazine.

Decisions were based on written essays about teaching methods and philosophies, and on interviews.

A representative from Good Housekeeping shadowed her for two days in Louisville, talked with students, observed classes, interviewed parents and conducted a 25-minute videotaped interview.

In February, she became one of four finalists. That was when she began to feel as though she were "carrying the school system's banner" and helping to bring recognition to a "state that's not given a lot of credit for its students or personnel."

On March 2, she was told she had won the national title.

She was grading papers in her classroom and was summoned to the office—State Superintendent of Public Instruction Alice McDonald was on the phone to say "congratulations."

Mrs. Sisney laughed, remembering the call. "I said, 'For what?'"

"She told me she wanted to line my room with roses, but to wipe the smile off my face and get back (to class) and act like nothing had happened."

So far, only her immediate family and a few close friends and school officials have known of the award.

Award officials had planned no public announcement until a press conference April 10 in Washington. But after contest officials said they wanted 30 students to attend the ceremonies, local school officials realized there would be no way to keep it quiet.

A school system spokeswoman, Rande Swann, said the district is "elated" about the honor for Mrs. Sisney. "We feel Sherleen certainly does exemplify the quality teacher that the Jefferson County Public Schools have come to know and enjoy."

The students will be told of the Washington trip tomorrow.

The students haven't been selected yet; transportation and other costs for their trip are still being discussed.

Ironically, in the same month that Kentucky is honored for having the nation's outstanding teacher, the state legislature rejected a proposal for more taxes to finance an education-improvement package. Mrs. Sisney said she expects interviewers to be curious about Kentucky's attitudes toward education.

She hopes the award will help break some stereotypes about education in Kentucky. She said she's delighted that her students and local school officials will share the limelight with her in Washington because they will present a positive image.

"There's a great deal for this state to be proud of, and we'll showcase that," she said.

As Mrs. Sisney speaks extensively about education during the next year, she said she hopes to convey these messages:

"I think it's time to get on a positive note about education," she said. The schools have come through a decade in which education was expected to solve everything, "from drug problems to venereal disease to social and emotional problems."

Schools need to deal with these problems, but shouldn't be expected to solve them single-handedly, she said. Their focus should be on education issues, such as reducing the dropout rate and finding ways to develop top-quality teachers.

The existing negativism in education can lead to "real opportunities" for change, she said, "but the door for opportunity won't stay open too long."

Educators must exert leadership more than ever before, she said. They need to talk to policy-makers and legislators about what can and can't be accomplished, and about what they can do to work with teachers, she said.

An economic-education program such as the one in her classroom, which includes "hands-on" projects and draws business leaders into the classroom, can help improve students' "opportunities for a better quality of life," she said.

Making economics relevant helps students be better consumers, wiser voters and better prepared for the job market, she said.●

POPULATION PRESSURES ARE PRELUDE TO CHAOS

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the world grew by an unprecedented 82 million people last year and it is projected to grow by 90 million a year annually. I believe we should all be paying a great deal more attention to reducing rampant world population growth, which is taking a tremendous toll in human misery—especially in the developing world.

I would like to share with you today an article by syndicated columnist Carl T. Rowan, which appeared in the April 7, 1984 edition of the Baltimore Sun. Mr. Rowan focuses on the Worldwatch Institute's recently published report "State of the World, 1984," which clearly defines the interrelationship between overpopulation and the world economy. It is my hope that we will all keep this article in mind when we discuss one of the most effective facets of our international development program, U.S. population assistance, in our committees and on the floor of this House.

The article follows:

PRELUDE TO CHAOS: POPULATION PRESSURE, WORLD RESOURCES

WASHINGTON.—Time was when American intellectuals and the American press were writhing in concern over "the population bomb" and the prospects of widespread starvation around the world.

How long ago it seems that we waited in line at gas stations and President Nixon gave somber warnings about "the energy crisis"!

But now, even though starvation wreaks its grim toll in several parts of the world and rampant population growth threatens many societies, we hear of little talk in America about the worldwide need for family planning and population control.

The world oil glut of recent years has lulled millions of Americans into thinking there isn't, never was and never will be a genuine energy crisis—even though the Reagan administration has positioned elements of the U.S. Navy to stop any blockage of the flow of petroleum from the Persian Gulf through the Straits of Hormuz.

We Americans go from fads of towering concern about social and economic problems to dangerous and ignorant attitudes of "who-gives-a-damn?" about those very same challenges. I was reminded of this when I read "State of the World, 1984," a jarring new report from Worldwatch Institute, a Washington-based research group. That report, directed by Lester R. Brown, made me newly aware that the upturn in the U.S. economy has caused us to ignore the fact that much of the world remains in such economic distress as to constitute a threat to all countries.

Since you have no problem buying gasoline now, you may not want to believe Mr. Brown when he writes that dwindling oil supplies pose the most immediate threat to economic progress in much of the world. The wealthy United States has made its adjustments to the incredible jump in the price of petroleum, but a lot of poorer nations have been dragged to the brink of disaster by the grossly inflated cost of energy.

The Worldwatch report says that the depletion of soils may be more severe than a decline in oil supplies in the long run, and that shrinking forests and deteriorating grasslands are of great concern.

We already are seeing a reduction in food supplies. World grain output, which rose steadily during the quarter century after World War II, has increased little or none in the last decade. In Africa, Mr. Brown notes, food production per capita has been falling since 1970, slowly dragging that continent into a pathetic crisis. Around the globe, more than half a billion persons are hungry or malnourished, and famine threatens more nations than at any time in recent history.

The eradication of hunger may depend as much on family planners as on farmers. Although the world's growth rate slowed from 1.9 percent a year in 1970 to 1.7 percent in 1983, the annual population increase in raw numbers has continued to edge up. Another 79 million people were added to this planet last year, compared to 70 million in 1970. The United Nations and the World Bank estimate that world population will more than double, reaching 10 billion, before stabilizing. We face projections of India with 1.84 billion persons, Nigeria growing from today's 84 million to 623 million, Mexico soon reaching the population that the United States has today.

These population pressures become even more ominous when viewed in conjunction with the economic slowdown. Between 1950 and 1973, the world economy expanded about 5 percent a year while population grew at less than 2 percent. But since 1979, Worldwatch found, economic growth and population growth have been the same—1.7 percent annually.

If you live in Germany or Hungary, which have stabilized their populations, even a 2 percent rate of economic growth brings improved living standards. But if you live in

Pakistan or Ecuador, where populations are growing at 3 percent a year, a 2 percent rate of economic growth means a sustained decline in living standards. Eighteen countries, most of them in Africa, experienced a decline in per capita income during the 1970s, according to Worldwatch.

The key to improving living standards, says Mr. Brown, is to relate population to available resources. One of the first developing countries to recognize this was China. The Chinese systematically examined long-term population growth in relation to the availability of land, water, energy and other basic resources and to the capacity of the economy to provide jobs.

"By focusing on living conditions in the future, child-bearing decisions were shifted from the welfare of parents, concerned about support in their old age, to the welfare of children," explains Mr. Brown.

The result was adoption of a one-child-per-family policy. It is a drastic step, draconian in many eyes but one which Mr. Brown believes other nations may have to follow if they are to avoid a serious decline in living standards.

All of us, in nations rich and poor, must rise above the "fad" approach to managing our resources, limiting population growth, making societies live within their means. If we don't, we will invite widespread human suffering and the political chaos that inevitably comes with it.●

A TRIBUTE TO ANSEL ADAMS

HON. RICHARD H. LEHMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, this week Congress must note with great sadness the death of a great American photographer, Ansel E. Adams. Born in 1902, Ansel Adams became known internationally as America's premiere photographer. As large in physique as he was in spirit, Adams was a technician who put his soul into his work.

His artistry was as diverse as our national parks. But Adams always returned to the Sierra Nevadas for inspiration. Yosemite Valley, the John Muir Trail and Mono Lake had no better friend than this "photolaurate" of the American West.

Adams interpreted the American wilderness and he also fought to preserve it. For his conservation work, he was honored with the Sierra Club's John Muir Award, the Conservation Service Award from the Department of the Interior and the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Adams' vision, his humor, and his fresh approach to the world around us are the human legacies he has left alongside his art.

Ansel Adams illuminated the grandeur of California's remarkable landscape for millions who have never experienced it.

For those of us who have, he both deepened and sharpened our aware-

ness that great miracles are still happening about us.

His impact as a Sierra naturalist can only be compared with John Muir. His work will survive for all time.●

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION NEEDED TO REBUILD APPALACHIAN ECONOMY

HON. FREDERICK C. BOUCHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, as a result of recent declines in the coal industry, the coal-producing counties of the Appalachian region are experiencing their worst economic times in five decades.

While the efforts we are making in the Committee on Science and Technology to increase the Federal commitment to research and development for new coal technologies promises expanded markets for coal, few believe that in the years ahead the coal industry will enjoy the prosperous times which blessed it in the 1970's.

Accordingly, it is clear that diversification of the economy in the Appalachian region is vital to a restoration of our progress and to the creation of employment opportunities for our population. Since its inception in the mid-1960's, the Appalachian Regional Commission has provided roads, schools, sewer and water facilities, clinics and other infrastructure providing an attraction of new industry into the 13-State Appalachian region. At this time, the work of the Appalachian Regional Commission is as vitally needed as it was nearly two decades ago. The revitalization and the rejuvenation of our economy depends today upon our ability to attract high technology firms and other industries unrelated to the production of coal. That effort can succeed only if the Appalachian Regional Commission continues to provide the public facilities which will attract such firms to our region.

The point that ARC must continue for these purposes is concisely stated in a recent editorial appearing in the Bristol Herald Courier, and I commend this careful statement to my colleagues:

STARTING OVER

The Appalachian Regional Commission, initiated two decades ago to help the nation's poorest 13-state region lift itself up by its bootstraps, is almost in a position of "starting over."

That is no criticism of the ARC; it has accomplished a great deal. Nor have the bootstraps broken; they're still strong.

The problem is in the "boots" of the region—mining and heavy industry. They are frayed by hard times, with no revival in sight.

Winifred A. Pizzano, cochairman of the ARC, had this to say at a three-day confer-

ence in Hershey, Pa., on the problems of dislocated workers in the mountainous region which stretches from Maine to Alabama:

"The industrial boom in the United States is over. No amount of modernization can return us to our former position of a heavy-industry superstar. We can't turn the clock back. We must move toward the great new enterprises of the future."

The options are few. Unemployed miners and industrial workers can be retrained and encouraged to go where the jobs are; high-tech industries can be importuned to move into Appalachian areas; or some industries, such as coal mining, can be rejuvenated, to some extent, by research and development into new (and greater) use of coal—after the fashion of Eastman's new chemical plant in Kingsport and United Coal Company's liquid-coal research in Bristol.

A major problem has to do with human nature. Many coal miners and steel workers believe—perhaps because they want to believe—that the good times in their industries will return; it's just a matter of toughing it out.

Moreover, many if not most of them are determined to "stay at home." Their work is a family tradition, stretching back several generations. The trauma of breaking that tradition, of leaving the family "hearth," is avoided if hope burns even faintly.

Retraining those among the adult unemployed who are willing to be retrained is a necessary first step. Beyond that, however, greater attention must be given to young people, guiding them away from the mines and the mills and toward that different "way of life" demanded by technology and economic circumstances. It is an effort which must be made particularly in the schools of the 13-state region—revealing new worlds of work in the elementary grades and placing even greater emphasis on vocational education in junior high and high school.

If new industries are to be enticed into the mountain-locked areas of the Appalachian region, that region must be opened up still further—with more and better highways, and connecting links; prospective industries must be convinced that the people of the Appalachians can adapt to new skills; they must be shown that the basic infrastructure—water lines, sewer lines, power lines, gas lines—is available for their needs.

All that, and more, is, indeed, virtually "starting over"—for the Appalachian Regional Commission and for the people of the region. Fortunately, the mechanism for "starting over" is in place. Making that mechanism work, and quickly, is a task which will ask much of—and return much to—the 13 states and the people of the mountains.●

THE THREAT OF A BALANCED-BUDGET CONVENTION WOULD FORCE NEEDED CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to an op-ed piece written by Griffin Bell, former Attorney General of the United States. Mr. Bell suggests that a balanced budget constitutional con-

vention would not wreak the havoc that some have predicted.

I have frequently spoken out for the need of a balanced budget. I have voted for balanced budgets. I have introduced constitutional amendments requiring balanced budgets, and I have voted for a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget.

Unfortunately, Congress has not yet found the discipline to pass a balanced budget. I prefer that a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget should be passed by Congress. But, I do believe that the threat of a constitutional convention is one method of stimulating congressional action toward achieving this goal. In fact, I am a member of a newly formed group known as "CLUBB," Congressional Leaders United for a Balanced Budget. This group was formed in a bipartisan manner to emphasize the importance of a balanced budget in the face of outrageous deficits that are devastating our economy. Griffin Bell points out the dramatic effect that deficits are having on our country, and goes on to explain how a constitutional convention would compel Congress to act when there is overwhelming pressure from the grassroots of our country to balance our budget.

I insert Mr. Bell's article for my colleagues' review.

[From the Atlanta Journal and Constitution, Apr. 23, 1984]

A BALANCED-BUDGET CONVENTION WOULD NOT WREAK HAVOC ON UNITED STATES

(By Griffin B. Bell)

Like most Americans, I am deeply concerned by the federal government's continuing failure to control the budget deficits. The interest payments on the debt now amount to 12 percent of the current budget. Basic to this failure is that no counterforce exists against the special interest groups which are the driving force behind the excessive government spending.

Because Congress has failed to control runaway government deficits, the people have acted through their state legislatures, 32 of which have called for a constitutional convention to draft a balanced federal budget amendment. When 34 states have so acted, Congress, under Article V of the Constitution, must call a convention.

We are now hearing predictions of doom and gloom which have not been heard since the passage of the Seventeenth Amendment 72 years ago. In our original Constitution, senators were appointed by the state legislatures, rather than elected by the people. By 1912, the people had concluded by a wide margin that the Senate should be elected, not appointed. The House of Representatives agreed, five times passing a proposed constitutional amendment to make the Senate elective.

But five times the Senate killed the amendment in committee, thereby forcing the people to take action. State legislatures began passing conditional calls for a convention if Congress did not approve the amendment.

At that time, the two-thirds required equalled 32 state legislatures. When 31 states had acted, the Senate read the hand-

writing on the wall and passed the amendment. Without the use of the alternative route in Article V of our Constitution, the 17th Amendment would not have been passed and senators would still be appointed.

This is precisely what the Founding Fathers had in mind. They provided for amendment through action of the state legislatures to deal with those situations in which the people and the state legislatures saw the problem and the need for change, but in which the Congress was part of the problem and would not act. That situation prevailed in 1912. It prevails equally in 1984.

Aside from the specious argument that a convention is "alien" to the constitutional process, we also hear other objections. It is argued that our friends abroad would recoil in horror at the prospect of a U.S. constitutional convention which would presumably destabilize America. But the Free World has been decimated by our interest rates and the dollar exchange rate which foreign financial experts attribute to our huge deficits and general fiscal profligacy. A serious effort to install long-term constitutional control over U.S. fiscal practices would be welcomed by our friends abroad.

Also, we are bombarded with ominous stories about a "runaway" constitutional convention which, presumably, would repeal the Bill of Rights, dismantle the Constitution and install some sort of totalitarian regime. Well, while we have not had a federal convention since 1787, there have been over 200 conventions held in various states, many of whose constitutions provide for periodic conventions to propose amendments. Such gatherings have brought out the best, not the worst, in people's government.

It is claimed that James Madison said that a "new" constitutional convention would be a cloud over the Constitution. He did indeed utter those words, but in response to critics who declared that the Constitution written in Philadelphia in 1787 should be rejected and a new convention be held immediately. Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, assumed that we would have a new convention about every 20 years.

In fact, fears about a "runaway" convention are groundless. The various state applications to Congress not only exhort Congress to pass the Tax Limitation-Balanced Budget Amendment, but limit the scope of a convention to the sole and exclusive purpose of the balanced budget issue.

Those who wring their hands over the prospects of a convention run the risk of exposing their elitism, implying that the average citizen cannot be trusted. At the same time, they are willing to place their full faith in Congress, the very institution that has precipitated the fiscal mess which, in turn, has prompted the constitutional Tax Limitation-Balanced Budget movement.

But suppose that other resolutions were offered at the balanced-budget convention. Congress would not be compelled, nor would it have any incentive, to send along to the states for ratification any proposals emanating from the convention that exceeded the scope of the call. And 38 states are not about to ratify any proposal that does violence to or seeks to dismantle fundamental constitutional protections and guarantees.

Finally, it is important to understand that a convention will not necessarily take place upon the application of 34 states. The state calls have said: If Congress does not pass the amendment, then a convention for the

purpose is called. The calls are conditional, not absolute.

I believe there will not be a balanced-budget constitutional convention. Congress simply will not abide letting mere citizens decide its taxing and spending power. Congress will act, I predict, as it did on the issue of the direct elections of senators—when overwhelming pressure from the states and the people can no longer be ignored. ●

CHANGE U.S. POLICY ON CHILE

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been rightfully concerned over the past few years with recent events in Chile. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent essay on this subject that appeared recently in the Chicago Tribune, written by Peter Kornbluh. In his article, Mr. Kornbluh discusses the dilemma we face in Chile and spells out the tough choices that must be made there. I recommend this article be read by all my colleagues who are interested in resolving the contradiction we seem to continually face in defining and defending our priorities in dealing with dictatorships of the right and left in this hemisphere.

The essay follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 8, 1984]

CHANGE U.S. POLICY ON CHILE

(By Peter Kornbluh)

It is time to design a new United States policy toward the Pinochet regime in Chile. The recent massive anti-government protests against the continuation of the 10-year-old military dictatorship, and the ensuing repression which has left several people dead, dozens injured and hundreds arrested, pose major problems for Gen. Augusto Pinochet's already unstable rule. They also pose a problem for the Reagan administration, which must decide whether to support the faltering regime or take a strong position in support of a return to Chilean democracy.

Until recently, the Reagan administration pursued a policy of "treating friends as friends" in Chile. Ostracized by Jimmy Carter for flagrant rights violations and for sending its agents to assassinate former Chilean Ambassador Orlando Letelier and a colleague, Ronni Moffitt, in the streets of Washington in September 1976, the regime found itself being solicited by the United States after Ronald Reagan's election. "We had a very pleasant tea," United Nations Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick told the press after meeting with Pinochet in August, 1981. "My conversation with [Pinochet] had no other fundamental purpose than for me to propose to him my government's desire to fully normalize our relations with Chile."

Over the last three years the Reagan administration methodically reversed or repealed all policies that have divided the United States and Chile. President Reagan lifted Carter's sanctions against the Pinochet government for its role in the Letelier-Moffitt murders. The administration stopped supporting UN resolutions con-

demning Chile's human rights record. Most significantly, the administration lobbied for an end to the 1976 legislative prohibition on U.S. military sales and aid to the regime. Congress complied, but it mandated that no military assistance could go to Chile until the President certified that the regime has improved human rights and has taken steps to bring to justice the three Chilean officials implicated in the Letelier-Moffitt murders.

This the Reagan administration is unable to do. Washington has gotten little in return for the largess it has showered on Pinochet. The escalation of human rights violations—more than 85 persons have been shot to death and 5,000 have been arrested in the last 10 months of national protests—has made a mockery of the administration's argument that it can effectively discourage such behavior through "quiet diplomacy" and close diplomatic relations with Chile. All attempts to prod the Chilean authorities to institute even superficial human rights reforms that might enable the administration to certify Chile, or to bring the killers of Letelier and Moffitt to trial, have failed.

Rather than a friend, Pinochet has proven a liability. Like the Shahs and Somozas of this world, the general has become his own worst enemy. Pinochet, who recently told Newsweek magazine that "I get my strength from God" and that "destiny" led him to rule Chile, now faces the worst crisis in his 10 years in power. Once considered an "economic miracle" by the international business community, the Chilean economy is reeling under the worst depression in Latin America. National protests, like the one that shook Santiago late last month, have been held almost every month since May, and thousands of Chileans have taken to the streets in unprecedented public demonstrations against a continuation of military rule.

Belatedly, the Reagan administration has begun to hedge its bets in Chile. Praise for the regime's economic accomplishments and support the what UN Ambassador Kirkpatrick has called "Chile's serious and, we believe, hopeful process of liberalization moving toward democratization"—a process under which Pinochet rules until 1989, when he has the option of being the sole candidate in elections for a presidential term ending in 1997—are now coupled with cautious but open condemnation of human rights violations and calls for a return to civilian rule.

But Washington's policy contradicts its rhetoric. Last September, in the midst of protests surrounding the 10th anniversary of military rule in Chile, the administration restored Overseas Private Investment Corp. guarantees to Chile, lifting a sanction Jimmy Carter had imposed in the Letelier case and signaling the regime that it was willing to help alleviate Chile's economic problems by promoting U.S. investment. Earlier this year, when Vice President George Bush was publicly urging the regime to adhere to democratic principles, Kirkpatrick was busy defending Chile against a UN resolution condemning the continuation of human rights violations in that country.

If U.S. policymakers are sincere about their desire to see democracy return to Chile, they must take a new approach toward the Pinochet regime.

First, the Reagan administration must thoroughly redefine its concept of a "friendly" government. Anti-communist though it is, the Chilean junta is still responsible for killing American citizens and promoting

international terrorism. Moreover, its free market capitalism has not saved American business interests from incurring heavy losses during the present economic crisis.

Second, to promote a return to democracy, the administration must make it unequivocally clear, through concrete policy as well as rhetoric, that Chile will receive no support—no loans to lessen the burden of its \$17 billion foreign debt, no American defense at the United Nations to deflect criticism of its human rights record and no military or economic aid—until the military returns to its barracks and free elections are held.

Finally, the administration must accept that a return to a true democracy in Chile will necessarily include the participation of the Chilean Socialist and Communist parties, the mainstays of the last freely elected Chilean government. Any attempt by Washington to exclude the Chilean left, which represents a substantial amount of the opposition to Pinochet, from participating in a transition to democracy can only backfire and lead to unnecessary animosity in U.S. relations with a post-Pinochet Chile.

Change in Chile is in the air. The Reagan administration may be forced to decide whether to "stay the course" with Pinochet or disassociate the United States from the regime and pursue a policy predicated upon a true concern for human rights and democratic principles. Washington can go down the blood-soaked path of supporting another corrupt and vicious dictatorship to the end. Or it can take the road not taken before, and establish a higher moral and pragmatic ground for our foreign policy toward Chile. ●

A WAY TO NEGOTIATE

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, these wise words by our colleague, LEE HAMILTON, reflect a similar view summed up by John F. Kennedy in his inaugural address: "We should never negotiate out of fear, but we should never fear to negotiate."

LEE HAMILTON is clearly one of our most thoughtful and talented colleagues.

The following article appeared in the Indianapolis News on March 31, 1984.

[From the Indianapolis News, Mar. 31, 1984]

A WAY TO NEGOTIATE

(By Lee Hamilton)

While the installation of a new Soviet General Secretary, Konstantin Chernenko, raised hopes for better relations between the two superpowers, the most important aspect of those relations, strategic arms control, is showing little improvement. Each side is waiting for the other to make the first move.

We should recognize that the Kremlin's change of leadership gives us a chance to get Soviet-American arms control talks moving. The transaction could open a way for Moscow out of the bind it created for itself when it broke off the Geneva negotiations. Though uncertainties surrounding the new Kremlin leadership make it unlikely that

the Soviets will take the lead in negotiations, we should not hesitate to do so.

A first step on the road back might be to resume the practice of holding regular high-level meetings with top Soviet leaders. Though every president since Franklin Roosevelt met with his Soviet counterpart, President Reagan is still reluctant. More high-level contact will not guarantee progress in arms control, but agreements are unlikely without a more positive political climate. Toward this same end, the Reagan administration should also open a direct arms control dialogue with Chernenko, either by appointing a new negotiator who is close to the President, or by resuscitating the "back channel" or secret, high-level talks successfully used by previous president.

Taking advantage of what may be our last opportunity to head off a dangerous arms race in anti-satellite (ASAT) weapons is another possible step for U.S. arms controllers. The Soviet Union has tested an ASAT weapon, and the United States now has ASAT tests under way. Neither side has perfected or deployed an ASAT weapon able to destroy vital communications and early-warning satellites. Why not seize the moment and propose a mutual moratorium on ASAT tests and an immediate resumption of negotiations toward a permanent ban?

The Reagan administration should also look for a creative way to resume European and inter-continental arms control talks. Currently, medium-range "theater" weapons deployed in Europe are discussed separately from long-range "strategic" arms. Merging the two would give the new Soviet leadership a face-saving way to restart arms control talks, and make it easier to settle on the kind of tradeoffs the Reagan administration has said it wants.

Some differences have prevented progress in the area of strategic nuclear weapons. The Soviets would still like a treaty with SALT II's basic structure: limits on the number of bombers and missile launchers. Predictably, this offer is unacceptable to a president who campaigned against SALT II. Instead, the Reagan administration emphasizes reducing the number of warheads on Soviet land-based missiles, where Moscow has put most of its nuclear firepower. A good compromise would be for the United States to agree to Soviet ceilings on missile launchers if, in turn, the Soviets agreed to U.S. proposals to cut missile warheads. The demands of both sides could be met by two separate reduction schedules.

Both superpowers have an interest in improving "crisis communications," the network of satellite and telephone hookups which allows Washington to reach out and touch Moscow in a crisis, and possibly prevent an accident. Two rounds of discussions on upgrading the "hotline" have been held, and strong diplomacy could bring an agreement within reach.

Arms control can't wait until after the election. There has been no nuclear arms control agreement since 1972 and the value of existing agreements, particularly the SALT accords, is depreciating fast. If weapons now being tested are produced and deployed, it will further complicate our ability to reach agreements or verify them. Democrats and Republicans in Congress are ready to work with the White House to get arms control moving again. It is now up to the President to lead. ●

DR. EDWARD J. FEENEY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, Edward J. Feeney, the superintendent of the Prince Georges County schools, will retire.

Under the stewardship of Ed Feeney, the Prince Georges County Public Schools have grown and developed into a system that has received national accolades on many fronts. During extremely difficult fiscal times, Dr. Feeney was able to offer innovative new programs which provided renewed community interest and spirit in our schools, so critical to education, while maintaining quality in the regular classrooms.

He created a senior citizens program in which seniors volunteered and shared their time, talent, and considerable knowledge and skills with youngsters.

He helped develop and expand the specific language reading development program (SLRD) which produced instructional techniques for teachers in 3d to 12th grade.

He has also been very involved in the talented and gifted program. The school system now serves 6,000 students identified as exceptional children.

At the same time, he has provided the system with two Science and Technology Centers at Roosevelt and Oxon Hill Senior High Schools. This innovative program offers a highly structured 4-year program in scientific and technical fields as well as providing a well-rounded normal high school program. The program is offered by application only and an entrance exam is required.

Of the many hundreds of other programs initiated or nurtured by Dr. Feeney, let me mention, in conclusion, his new office for business and industry within the superintendent's office. This office will work with local business and industry in developing partnerships with the schools. These large and small businesses will assist the school system in developing needed programs and will sponsor various career activities in the schools.

Ed Feeney has been a critical force in education since 1953, when he began teaching at the elementary school level. He then moved into several administrative positions before his appointment by the Board of Education as Superintendent of Schools in 1976.

In addition, Dr. Feeney, as the chairman of the Maryland State Graduation Requirements/Diploma Task Force, worked for the improvement of high school instruction in Maryland through recommendations the task

force made to the Maryland Commission on Secondary Education.

Ed Feeney has long been a leader in the struggle for educational excellence in this county. Throughout some of the most difficult times in the recent history of our schools—through a desegregation order, through the trend of declining test scores, through extremely tight fiscal constraints—Ed Feeney has charted a course aimed at excellence.

He is dedicated to the cause of education, to the goal of bringing every child up to his or her potential.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues here in the House would join with me today in wishing Ed Feeney all the best for his future, and in congratulating him for his fine achievements in maintaining and enhancing the quality of education in Maryland.●

RAISE HELL, NOT TAXES

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit in the RECORD an outstanding editorial which appeared in the April 16 Dallas Morning News.

The editorial makes three points, none of which the leadership of this House understands.

First, the editorial points out that Ronald Reagan's tax revolution has not resulted in lower taxes for most Americans; rather changes in the tax code he proposed have merely allowed us to hold the line against taxes. The editorial also points out that higher Federal spending—not lower Federal tax rates—have caused our large Federal deficits.

Second, the editorial makes the point that with regard to tax rates, more often means less. In defending the notion that people work and invest to make money for themselves, not to pay more to the Federal Government, the editorial points out that higher tax rates reduce incentives for Americans to work and produce, and therefore, often result in lower Federal revenue.

And third, the editorial calls for a basic restructuring of our tax system, pointing out that the House's recently approved tax bill, which I opposed, manages to increase both taxes as well as the complexity of the Federal Tax Code.

I commend the editorial "Raise Hell, Not Taxes" to my colleagues. It contains an honesty and simplicity that is usually missing when this Chamber discusses revenue matters.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Apr. 16, 1984]

RAISE HELL, NOT TAXES

The minutes dwindle down to a precious few. Pretty soon, midnight, April 16—hour of reckoning for that well-known beast of burden, the American taxpayer. A few basic points need attention.

Such as:

What, in fact, has Ronald Reagan done during the now-three-year-old course of his presidency? Has he drastically slashed taxes, especially for the rich, and thus bloated the deficit?

Hardly. Revenues now consume a bit over 19 percent of the gross national product, which is close to the average for the past two decades and the same as in 1979.

Overall, Reagan's income-tax cuts, splendid and necessary as they were, succeeded only in holding the line against taxes, not in reducing them. Those cuts were offset by bracket creep and increases in state and local taxes, Social Security taxes and the gas tax, and by 1982's infamous TEFRA (the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act), merely the largest tax hike in history.

The deficit has grown not because revenues have decreased but because spending has increased, a fact that J. Peter Grace's committee on cost control demonstrated overwhelmingly.

Over the last eight years, revenues have increased an average of 10 percent a year, but spending by 12 percent, hence the deficit.

Since Reagan took office spending has increased from 20 to 24 percent of GNP. As a percentage of the budget or of GNP, Reagan's spending for social programs has been about twice as great as President Kennedy's 20 years earlier, and his defense spending only about half as much as Kennedy's.

Nor has Reagan left the poor to starve. Indeed, a conservative estimate is that the total of spending on Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, unemployment benefits, housing programs, food stamps, child nutrition, Aid to Families With Dependent Children and other programs is considerably higher under Reagan than it was during the last year of the Carter administration.

It is of course true that these massive expenditures have failed to end poverty. But are we to dun taxpayers even more so that these programs can fail at even greater levels of expense? Tip O'Neill and his coterie plainly think so. Only last week they shepherded a \$49.2 billion tax bill through the House. The consensus among the surviving Democratic presidential candidates is that, far from being too high, taxes are too low.

Second point:

Haven't Reagan's tax cuts let the rich off while unfairly burdening the rest of us? Reagan did, after all, cut the maximum tax rate from 70 to 50 percent.

It is on this last point that the supply-side insight is borne out most strikingly. Under Reagan, the share of taxes paid by the poor and the middle class has fallen. One of the supply-side insights, of course, which is really nothing more than common sense, is that you don't necessarily get more revenue by raising the tax rates. Indeed, you often get less.

This, along with runaway federal spending, is why the national debt has steadily risen despite steady rises in the tax rates. In 1979, 65 percent of taxpayers paid marginal rates above 20 percent, and 18 percent paid rates above 31 percent. In 1961 only 12 percent paid marginal rates above 22 percent.

Why, after all, do people work and invest? To make money for themselves, not for the government. When they find the government taking more and more, they work and invest less and less. Thus the tax base shrivels, and with it revenue intake.

What increases is the desire to beat the IRS, either through complex legal maneuvering or simple evasion.

Think of the total cost of all the straining to avoid tax exposure: the tax shelters, the underground economy, the work hours lost in paper work instead of productive labor or investment. Not to mention the ever-expanding brigade of IRS snoopers. It's impossible to say what it all comes to—perhaps a trillion dollars annually.

Third point:

The present tax system, which is intellectually indefensible, as well as morally corrupting, needs to be junked and replaced by a flat-rate tax or value-added tax (a sort of national sales tax).

Yet the House's new tax bill would not only increase taxes, but make the tax code even more complex than it is now. Reagan's tax cuts, on the other hand, have been a remarkable booster shot for the economy.

And contrary to the typically wrongheaded warnings of Reagan's critics, his tax cuts have not triggered inflation, which has been stunningly reduced. President Carter's policies, though, are among the considerable evidence that inflation walks hand-in-hand with high taxes.

What reason, then, can there be for advocating higher taxes? Just one: Soak-the-rich bombast still apparently makes political sense, even as, economically, it makes for absurdity.

Cheer that one over tonight on your way to the post office.●

TRIBUTE TO J. FOSTER FLUETSCH

HON. RICHARD H. LEHMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1984, the Downtown Association of Stockton, CA, honors the work of J. Foster Fluetsch, president of American Savings & Loan, for his involvement and support for the Downtown Stockton community.

American Savings and its predecessor, State Savings & Loan, have played a significant role in the growth and vitality of the city of Stockton. The first branch was downtown, and the association continued operations through this single branch for many years.

In 1960 State Savings was purchased by a group called Valley Partners, and a new building was built at the corner of El Dorado and Channel. This building served as State's corporate headquarters until the recent move of top executives to Main and Sutter in Stockton. Also in 1960, Valley Partners purchased Stanislaus-Merced Savings, and after 2 years the two associations were merged under the name of State Savings, with approximately \$50

million in combined assets and six facilities.

From 1962 to 1970 State Savings continued to expand its branch system. In 1964 Budget Industries bought a controlling interest in State Savings from Valley Partners. In 1971 State acquired Vallejo Savings, bringing the association's assets to more than \$100 million, and expanding the branch system into the bay area.

"By 1975 State Savings had 27 branches, and at this stage we began our innovative approach to the savings and loan industry," says Fluetsch. State Savings set the pace by offering Visa accounts, secured by savings. "The whole concept of a Visa card offered by an S&L was scoffed at by the industry, but by 1982, virtually all of the leading California S&L's had begun to offer the service," says Fluetsch.

American Savings & Loan is the largest savings and loan in the world, with assets totaling more than \$26 billion, and just over 2,000 employees in Stockton alone. It is the largest employer in San Joaquin County, having a monthly payroll in excess of \$5 million. American Savings has grown to 122 branches in California. They occupy over 740,000 square feet in Stockton. Long-range projections estimate Stockton employment for American Savings & Loan will be 2,500.

J. Foster Fluetsch, chief executive officer of American Savings & Loan, has spent his entire career in the financial field, first in banking and then in the savings and loan business. In 1959 he joined State Savings as a loan officer.

He moved rapidly through a variety of savings and lending managerial positions. He became president of State Savings in 1972. State Savings and American Savings merged in August 1983 and in January 1984, Fluetsch was named chairman of the board of American Savings. Fluetsch is also the vice chairman of the board of Financial Corp. of America, American's parent company.

Fluetsch graduated from high school in Merced and from Stanford University. While working for State Savings in Merced he began serving in community organizations such as Kiwanis and United Givers. In Stockton he continued this pattern, serving in important positions in United Way, Stockton Chamber of Commerce, California State Chamber of Commerce, California Savings & Loan League, and the Boy Scouts, whose Forty Niner Council honored him with the "Distinguished Citizen of the Year Award" in 1979.

Art is one of Fluetsch's hobbies, and he is both a collector and painter. He and his wife, Jimi Lou, have six children.

It is with great pride that special recognition in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD is made to J. Foster Fluetsch and American Savings & Loan. It is a pleasure to honor this outstanding Stockton citizen and his commitment to this community.●

OREGON'S SMALL BUSINESSMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, as small businesses grow, so grows our Nation.

So it is particularly appropriate that we honor some of those in the small business community who are showing us what innovation, productivity, and economic growth are all about.

Thomas H. Bruggere, the founder of one of Oregon's fastest growing high-technology companies, Mentor Graphics Corp., was recently honored as the Small Business Administration's Businessman of the Year.

Mentor Graphics, which Bruggere founded just 3 years ago, now has 260 employees and has emerged as one of the Nation's leading suppliers of computer-aided engineering systems.

A recent issue of the Oregonian included a story noting this well-deserved recognition of Bruggere, and I would like to share it with my colleagues. The article follows:

SBA PICKS FOUNDER OF MENTOR

Thomas H. Bruggere, the founder of one of Oregon's fastest-growing, new high-technology companies, has been named the state's small businessman of the year by the federal Small Business Administration.

The award recognizes the rapid success of Bruggere's Beaverton-based company, Mentor Graphics Corp., as well as its founder's effort in improving the state's industrial-growth environment.

The award was presented Wednesday in ceremonies at the 3-year-old company's new headquarters in an industrial part near Washington Square. Edwin G. Sleater, acting director of the SBA's Portland district office, represented the federal agency charged with fostering the growth of small business.

Bruggere, who is 37 and a former computer software engineer for Tektronix Inc., is a candidate for the national title of small-business person of the year, to be announced by President Reagan during Small Business Week, May 6-12.

Bruggere said he was "pleased and honored" by the award, which in part recognized Mentor's emergence as the industry's leading supplier of computer-aided engineering systems. Bruggere gave credit for the company's success to its 260 employees.

Mentor's computer-program systems allow electronics engineers to design complex computer-system circuitry on terminal screens. Such computer-aided systems substantially increase the efficiency of electronics designers.

In 1983, Mentor's first full year of sales, the company had nearly \$26 million in revenue. Systems were shipped to Europe and the Far East.

The company recently completed its first public stock offering, raising more than \$50 million for expansion.

Bruggere also has been active in the American Electronics Association (an industry trade group) in which he has served as Oregon chapter president and as a member of the national board of directors.

In Oregon, Bruggere helped the AEA establish its first state government lobbying effort during the 1983 legislative session. The office became a leading proponent of tax reform issues, including the aborted sales tax measure. Funded by the national organization, the AEA lobbying effort is expected to be expanded in Salem during the 1985 Legislature.●

RETIREMENT OF RICHARD RICHARDS, ONE OF OUR NATION'S FINEST CIVIL SERVANTS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, as all of us are politicians we are apt to criticize the Federal bureaucracy for its monstrous size and corresponding inertia. Yet we also are careful to portray Federal employees as people oriented and helpful, which given the size of the Federal Government can prove difficult. It is quite paradoxical this game we call politics.

Politics aside, some of our finest citizens make careers out of working for the Federal Government. At the end of this month, Richard C. Richards retires after 33 years of distinguished service. There is no one who better exemplifies how sensitive civil servants can be to the needs of our people than Dick.

Dick's career as a civil servant began following his graduation from the University of Pittsburgh. Prior to entering the university, he served in the Navy during World War II. After graduating, he took the unusual step of reentering the military to serve with the Army during the Korean conflict. He was honorably discharged as a captain and served several years thereafter in the Army Reserve.

His last 11 years have been spent as the assistant district manager of the Social Security Administration office in Long Beach. He has worked closely with my Long Beach staff and me and has always been tirelessly willing to go the extra mile for the people of Long Beach. He is truly one of the finest civil servants this country has ever known.

Mr. Speaker, my wife, Lee, joins me in extending our gratitude to Dick Richards for his many years of dedicated service to the people of the 32d District. We are thankful that Long Beach has been privileged to know him and his wife, Helen. We know

that their sons, Richard, Jr., and Randall, and their sons' wives, Holly and Kimberly, and their grandchildren, Nicole and Ryan, are extremely proud of and happy for him. We wish all of them the very best in the years ahead.●

KNOXVILLE TOPS LIST OF AMERICA'S CITIES

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that researchers are discovering what people back home have been saying for years; that Knoxville is one of the best cities in the country. A study conducted by Dr. Robert M. Pierce, of the State University of New York at Cortland, places Knoxville and Greensboro, NC, at the top of the list of places to live in the United States. Dr. Pierce ranked the 277 metropolitan areas in the country in a number of categories indicating the quality of life in a city.

Knoxvillians have always appreciated the beauty of their surroundings, the mild climate, the recreational value of the Great Smoky Mountains and TVA lakes. In recent years we have witnessed the growth of high technology firms along the technology corridor between Knoxville and Oak Ridge. The University of Tennessee offers higher education opportunities to all residents of the State, and is a showcase for cultural, academic, and athletic activities.

Many visitors from around the world enjoyed these qualities in 1982 when Knoxville hosted the World's Fair. It was in other areas, however, that Knoxville moved to the top of the list.

Dr. Pierce's survey looked at metropolitan areas and judged them on economics, climate, crime, housing, education, health care, recreation, transportation, and the arts. A greater weight was given to the first four categories, which have the greatest impact on an individual's life in a city. Knoxville's economic opportunities, low crime rate, and low housing costs, as well as its climate, were the attributes which placed Knoxville above the rest.

Dr. Pierce will present the complete results of his study to the Association of American Geographers at a meeting in the Nation's Capital this week.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WELCOME TO MR. GOH KHENG HOCK OF MALAYSIA

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely unusual to use this forum to welcome a visitor to our country from another nation. I want to do so, however, for it has been called to my attention that an unusual and fine gentleman is visiting us.

Mr. Goh Kheng Hock of Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, is arriving this week for a month-long tour of the United States. This is not his first visit to our country, and I am pleased to say that the circumstances surrounding his current stay are much more pleasant than the original occasion.

Mr. Hock first came to our country to have heart bypass surgery at the very fine Cleveland clinic in 1981. He shared facilities at the clinic with a good friend and constituent of mine, Mr. John Shukwit, who was in the clinic for the same type of surgery. These two gentlemen of very different backgrounds became close friends through their shared experience, and it is through Mr. Shukwit that I became aware of Mr. Hock. Mr. Shukwit and Mr. Hock are renewing their friendship with this visit, and I am pleased that they are able to as result of lives which have been extended through the contributions of our fine medical community. I wish them both many more years of good health and happiness.

Mr. Hock has made a strong contribution to his own country as an investment broker with the firm of Seagrott & Campbell, and I know both Malaysia and America will profit through this mutually beneficial exchange. The sharing of ideas and cultures on a personal level such as this can be critically important in our shrinking and increasingly tense world.

I am pleased to take this opportunity to welcome Mr. Goh Kheng Hock to the United States. I hope his visit will be most enjoyable and that he will have the opportunity to make many new friends while he is here.●

TOLERATING VIOLENCE

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, every day we open a newspaper or switch on the news to learn of yet another crazy killer, yet another case of child abuse, yet another brutal rape. For a moment, we are shocked. But then we

April 24, 1984

turn the page or change the channel, and our senses are restored.

Or are they? In a recent article, a constituent of mine, Gus Matzorkis, points out that our casual reaction to the civil violence that marks our daily life is erasing our sensitivity—and fostering further violence.

Mr. Matzorkis offers some valuable insights. I hope all of my colleagues find the time to read his article.

[From the Long Island (N.Y.) Newsday,
Mar. 18, 1984]

WE ARE ALL BEING RENDERED SENSELESS BY VIOLENCE

(By Gus Matzorkis)

The spectacle of slow, timid, interminably debated responses to those who commit crimes of murder, rape and assault clearly contributes to two blots on our national life.

One is the failure to provide a civilized degree of protection and security to unfending citizens going about the daily functions and activities of life.

The second is the contribution-by-default to a rising tolerance for violence and cruelty that would have been unthinkable just a few years ago.

In that it is subversive of the national character, the second blot is even more worrisome than the first. The first poses a threat but does not corrupt us. The second corrupts us by toughening us in ways that reasonably humane people should not be toughened. The brutalization of America has progressed to a point sometimes difficult for us, caught up in it, to clearly see.

Yet in the perspective of many other countries, and in the perspective of an earlier America we learn about, or ourselves remember, our present short-lived and casually felt reactions to the everyday civil violence around us is shocking.

In 1924 the murder of young Bobby Franks in Chicago by Richard Loeb and Nathan Leopold had such an impact that it became and long remained the "crime of the century" in the public mind. The subsequent trial was big news for months. Today it could not cause a fraction of such a national stir, and even in Chicago could not compete in public attention and memory with the sadistic mass murderers Richard Speck (eight student nurses slaughtered) and John Gacy (33 men and boys tortured and killed).

In 1954 Marilyn Sheppard was murdered in Bay Village, Ohio, a lakeshore community bordering Cleveland. The national and international interest was such during the trial of her husband that for many years, an American abroad who mentioned "Bay Village" or "Cleveland" to a French person or a Greek or German or Japanese would as often as not be asked, "Was Dr. Sam guilty?" No more.

No longer is there such instant international celebrity status for somebody-or-other Corona in California (25 victims) or the Rev. Jim Jones follower (accused but never convicted of the airport murders that preceded the Jonestown mass suicide/murder) or that guy-whose-name-I-can't-remember who tortured and killed dozens of men and boys in Texas or that other guy whose-name-I-don't-know who had a federal judge murdered somewhere in the West or whatshisname who claims to have murdered more than 100 people.

One wonders how much more savagery we will be able to incorporate into our concep-

tion of normal peacetime life and pass on to coming generations' conception of normalcy.

As we have been hammered by real-life and popular-entertainment displays of cruelty and violence, the unspeakable has become speakable, the incredible has become credible, the unbearable has become bearable. And the violence has become pervasive and the violent are becoming increasingly brazen.

A few highly publicized and much agonized-over executions of convicted murderers do not alter the basic fact that toughness on violent criminals is neither a present problem nor a looming danger in America. The conspicuous absence of such consistent, to-be-expected toughness now and the possible later explosion of an indiscriminate overtoughness neither tempered by mercy nor guided by reason is a potential problem and danger.

Civil libertarians should get it clear in their minds, and then help make it clear to the country, that their major concern is to fight for the rights of the innocent and the possibly innocent, not to endlessly plead the cause of the guilty in the name of all the rest of us. Sentimental slogans to the contrary, the two are not the same. The sappy rhetoric which for years has equated impassioned defense of the clearly guilty with an enlargement of everyone's rights has probably had its day.

The right people in the country had better recognize this in time, and act upon it. If Americans with equalitarian, compassionate and humanitarian impulses abrogate this responsibility, they are going to turn the game over to persons and groups without such impulses.

But why, at bottom, are so many contemporary Americans capable of doing such violence, often sadistically cruelly, in peacetime life, to other human beings—often unoffending persons unknown to them and even, sickeningly, such helpless victims as children, the elderly and the infirm? Isn't this a more fundamental question than any questions of apprehension, trial and punishment? It is, but we have no right to let killers roam until we can better answer it.●

A TRIBUTE TO MR. ELI BOYER

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is rare that I have an opportunity to recognize the efforts of an accomplished citizen who has given years of service to his community who is also a close friend. On May 17, 1984, Mr. Eli Boyer will be presented with the City of Hope's award, the Spirit of Life. Eli's dedication to his profession along with his involvement in many community activities and civic activities make him a deserving recipient of this most prestigious award.

Eli presently is a senior partner in the international accounting firm of Laventhol & Horwath. His professional accomplishments include an expertise in many areas of the field of accounting.

His contributions to the Jewish community are both extensive and commendable. Eli has worked to make organizations with which he is affiliated important forces in the community. Eli is a member of the national executive committee of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; a national vice chairman of the Large City Budgeting Conference of the Council of Jewish Welfare Divisions; key committees and the board of directors of the Jewish Federation Council of Greater Los Angeles; vice president of the Brandeis-Bardin Institute; vice president of Temple Israel and is on the board of the Nathan Adelson Hospice.

His other affiliations include the board of directors of the Los Angeles Club and French-American Chamber of Commerce, and the advisory council to the mayor for the department of water and power.

Professionally, Eli serves on the advisory board of the School of Business, University of California, Riverside. Eli and his wife, Michele, are the parents of two sons and one daughter.

For his selfless dedication to his profession, his faith, his community and his family, I ask the Members to join the board of directors of the City of Hope and myself in paying tribute to Mr. Eli Boyer.●

A TRIBUTE TO THE STUYVESANT TOWN AND PETER COOPER SECURITY DIVISION

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives the outstanding work of the security division in the Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village community—a New York City community which it is my pleasure to represent. Due to the diligence of the community's security division, the residents here consider this the safest place to live in Manhattan. When called upon, the security officers respond quickly and show a sensitivity and kindness toward the residents.

The security division has no small task in keeping the area safe for its residents of Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village, which is a virtual city within a city. The officers are responsible for the safety of almost 30,000 tenants in 110 buildings situated on 84 acres of land. The division operates 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.

The division works in close conjunction with the members of the 13th precinct and other law enforcement units and agencies. The outstanding

work of the security division is evidenced by the 19 awards for meritorious action which have been received by members of the division. Eight members of the security division, who have been recognized for effecting quality arrests, are: Sergeant Maldonado, Security Assistant Peter A. Herkenham, Security Officer Curtis G. Fields, Security Officer Robert J. Mulaney, Security Officer Bernard O'Callaghan, Security Officer Dennis R. Pogan, Security Officer Patrick M. Reilly, and Security Officer Edward V. Grace.

In addition to their law enforcement work, the division has gone forward with other civic-minded activities. The division has formulated and will distribute to all tenants a personal security reference guide which outlines precautions that promote individual and community safety and six of the patrol supervisors are qualified in cardiopulmonary resuscitation.

At a time when one hears so much about the breakdown in law enforcement, it is worthwhile to give special recognition to this security division's effective anticrime efforts.●

PRESIDENTIAL RANK AWARD

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my fellow colleagues, the achievements of a man recently honored with the highest recognition given Federal executives. Malcolm Randall, Director of the VA Medical Center in Gainesville, FL, was presented with the Presidential Rank Award during recent White House ceremonies. President Reagan told Mr. Randall and other recipients that they are "the people who are responsible for making our Government work."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Randall is a friend and fellow Floridian responsible for helping veterans throughout our country, through his contributions at Gainesville's VA Medical Center, and his work with the VA since 1946. Malcolm Randall was instrumental in the medical center's opening in 1967 and has been its only Director. He served 5 years as Chairman of the VA Chief Medical Director's Advisory Council, and was recently elected to the National Academy of Sciences Institute for Medicine. Mr. Randall is also a professor of health and hospital administration at the University of Florida's College of Health and Related Professions.

The accomplishments of Mr. Randall go on and on, and many cannot be expressed through a title or explanation because they involve him personally through sacrifices he has made

for others. The Presidential Rank Award is given each year to those senior Federal executives who show sustained, extraordinary accomplishment in management of the programs of the U.S. Government. The award itself consists of a check for \$20,000 and a plaque. It is authorized under the 1978 Civil Service Reform Act, which encourages compensation of Government employees based on performance.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to know Malcom Randall, as I am sure anyone that knows him is proud, but not just because of this award, but because he is one of the finest Americans around today, a man well-deserving of his national distinction. I am thankful to have this opportunity to acknowledge Malcom's accomplishments, and the fact that he has received the recognition he deserves through this award for exemplary service. ●

ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE THROUGH THE MEMORIAL DAY DISTRICT WORK PERIOD

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, a recent edition of the "Lawmakers" on PBS included a segment which focused upon the activities of the House regarding criminal justice legislation, and in particular upon the work of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice. Although I submitted a letter describing my views and the plans of the subcommittee, the contents of my letter were not adequately described. I am, therefore, taking this opportunity to review for my colleagues the activities of the subcommittee during this session, as well as to include the letter in the RECORD.

The Subcommittee on Criminal Justice has been working on two major projects this session. The first is sentencing reform legislation. Both the chairman of the Judiciary Committee (Mr. RODINO) and I have expressed our strong support for reforming Federal sentencing practices. We have introduced sentencing reform legislation, and the Criminal Justice Subcommittee has conducted 5 days of hearings on sentencing reform. Three more hearings are scheduled, and I expect to be able to conclude the hearings in May.

The subcommittee's second major project is legislation to help the innocent victims of crime. The subcommittee has held five hearings on this legislation, focusing principally on H.R. 3498, a bill sponsored by Messrs. RODINO, BERMAN, and some 50 other Members of Congress. The administra-

tion recently sent its proposed legislation to Congress, and the subcommittee will, of course, look carefully at it. I expect to complete hearings on crime victim legislation in early June.

In addition to these major projects, the subcommittee has been working on several other matters. The subcommittee has already held hearings on some of these matters, such as improving Federal criminal fine collection and H.R. 4826, a bill to prohibit non-consensual tape recording of telephone calls by Federal officials. Other matters, such as bank fraud and bank bribery and contraband in Federal prisons, will be the subject of hearings in May and ought to be ready for markup. Some portions of S. 1762 pending before the subcommittee appear to be noncontroversial, and the subcommittee may be able to mark them up without the necessity of a hearing.

The subcommittee schedule through the end of the Memorial Day district work period is as follows:

Wednesday, April 25—hearing on H.R. 5406, the Foreign Evidence Rules Amendment Act of 1984—10 a.m., room 2226, Rayburn House Office Building.

Thursday, April 26—hearing on H.R. 5405, the Financial Bribery and Fraud Amendments Act of 1984—10 a.m., room 2226, Rayburn House Office Building.

Wednesday, May 2—hearing on H.R. 5477, a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code with respect to providing or possessing contraband in a prison.

Thursday, May 3—hearing on sentencing reform legislation.

Wednesday, May 9—hearing on sentencing reform legislation.

Thursday, May 10—hearing on sentencing reform legislation.

Wednesday, May 16—markup.

Thursday, May 17—markup.

Wednesday, May 23—markup.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, April 10, 1984.

Ms. NINA GILDEN,

Producer, *Lawmakers*, WETA-TV, Arlington, VA.

DEAR Ms. GILDEN: I regret that my schedule has not allowed me to arrange an interview for your use on "Lawmakers." I appreciate the opportunity to express in writing my views of the criminal justice agenda of the current Administration.

I am deeply disturbed by the efforts of this Administration, and its allies in Congress, to politicize the criminal justice issue. The legislation espoused by the Department of Justice, and recently passed by the Senate, is for the most part a blatant use of the many myths about crime and criminal justice in order to exploit the fears of the public about its personal safety. There is simply no evidence to suggest that this so-called "sweeping anti-crime" legislation, with the exception of the "Justice Assistance Act", will have more than a negligible impact on the occurrence of crime. Rather, such studies as have been done suggest the

contrary. Moreover, whatever crime reduction is possible under these proposals would require fiscal costs unacceptable to the American public. It is highly misleading, if not cruel, to suggest to our citizens worried about crime that preventive detention or modification of the exclusionary rule, even if applied in State proceedings, would make our streets any safer.

There are, however, a number of facets of the criminal justice system, some of which are addressed in the Senate legislation, that are in need of reform. Changes in these areas will both facilitate the delivery of justice and help restore the public's respect for the system. In three of the most significant of these, the Criminal Justice Subcommittee, which I chair, is in the midst of diligent efforts to achieve reform.

During the first session of this Congress, the Subcommittee devoted considerable effort to legislation to reform the insanity defense in Federal court. This legislation, similar to provisions in the Senate-passed bill, was reported by the Judiciary Committee on the last day of the last session. I am currently attempting to resolve some of the concerns expressed by my colleagues about this legislation so that in the near future a bill enjoying strong bipartisan support may be presented to the full House.

At the beginning of this session, the Subcommittee began hearings on sentencing reform proposals. Both the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee and I have expressed our strong support for such reform by the introduction of reform legislation. Four days of hearings have been held, and an additional four are scheduled. I fully expect to complete the hearings by mid-May. This should leave more than ample time for sentencing reform legislation to move through the remainder of the legislative process. I must, however, add one note of caution: I do not believe that sentencing reform will be achievable this Congress unless that issue is kept separate from the highly volatile question of the death penalty.

The third major area involves legislation to help the innocent victims of crime. For many years, the criminal justice system has tended to overlook the particular needs of crime victims. Indeed, the criminal justice system has, with some fairness, been accused of further victimizing crime victims. Last year, Representative Peter W. Rodino, Jr., together with some 50 other Members of Congress, introduced legislation to help crime victims. The Subcommittee has held 5 days of hearings on the legislation. Just recently, the Administration sent its proposal to the Congress, and said that enactment of legislation to help crime victims has a high priority. The Subcommittee will have 2 days of hearings on the Administration proposal and then proceed to consideration of a bill.

In addition to these important issues, the Subcommittee is working on other portions of the Senate-passed legislation. Hearings have been held, or are scheduled, on bills to protect Federal officers from crimes of violence, improve the collection of fines, modify Federal evidence rules, expand bribery laws affecting bank officials, and prohibit the nonconsensual taping of phone conversations by Federal officials. Additional matters will be scheduled for consideration in the near future. I anticipate Subcommittee consideration of some of these bills in early May.

Finally, I cannot stress too much the political nature of the attacks on the House consideration of crime issues. One "title" of the so-called crime package is the "Justice

Assistance Act." Of all the components of the package, this is the most likely to have a real impact on crime. This bill was passed by the House last May, but languishes in the Senate. It could become law by a simple vote of the Senate; one can assume it is favored, since it was included in the package. Yet the Senate leadership refuses to bring the bill forward. This inaction raises serious doubts about the actual commitment of the Senate leadership to legislative action against crime.

Thank you again for the opportunity to express my view.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Member of Congress.●

RECOGNITION OF ROY W. MOGER

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, in the past 10 years both our Nation and the State of New York have commemorated their bicentennials. This period has given the residents of my State the opportunity to reflect on their heritage as New Yorkers and as Americans, and to use our shared experiences as a means of preparing ourselves and our society for the future.

On April 29, the citizens of the town of North Hempstead in Nassau County will gather to say goodbye to the bicentennial celebrations of the United States and New York, while at the same time launching the 200th anniversary celebration of the town. Throughout this period, the Greater Roslyn American Revolution Bicentennial Commission has sponsored a series of festivals, celebrations, and educational forums to heighten the appreciation of the community to the importance of these historic anniversaries.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to draw the attention of my colleagues to the contributions of Roy W. Moger, the chairman of bicentennial projects in North Hempstead. A local historian and lecturer, Roy W. Moger has been the driving force behind the town's commemorations for the past 10 years.

The commission first met in January of 1974. Since the first session, a wonderful stream of community projects, celebrations, grants to ongoing endeavors, concerts, seminars, and ceremonies has followed. While many served on the commission under Mr. Moger's guidance, countless more worked on the various projects and literally thousands of our citizens were beneficiaries of the commission's gifts to the community.

Mr. Speaker, such unbridled enthusiasm for our area's history and our future should not go unnoticed. I call to the attention of my colleagues the

splendid commitment of Roy W. Moger and those he led on a trip back through time. The knowledge and appreciation gained by these efforts are indeed priceless to those whose lives Mr. Moger and the commission have touched.●

END NICARAGUAN MINING

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, both Houses of Congress voted to condemn the mining of Nicaraguan harbors by CIA operatives—and with good reason. As many Members on both sides of the aisle pointed out, the mining is illegal, immoral, and doomed to fail.

For just 1 minute, I would like to expand on that sentiment with some general comments on so-called covert operations. A recent study reports that the United States has undertaken 45 covert operations—both for and against foreign governments—since 1963. About half of them—most notably the assassination of Diem in South Vietnam and Allende in Chile—are ironically labeled successes. Others—including our efforts to keep the ayatollah out of Iran—are properly listed as failures. Just about all of them have succeeded only in creating a deep-seated distrust of U.S. policy abroad. In that sense, they are all failures.

The reason is simple. Covert operations—clandestine attempts to overthrow foreign governments and murder foreign leaders—are inherently un-American. They require secrecy in a democracy that thrives on public debate. And when the truth eventually is known—as it always is—we end up looking immoral, inept, or both.

The CIA war against Nicaragua is still filed in the "inconclusive" category. But it too will fail. By fighting the most publicized secret war in history, in clear violation of United States and international law, we are losing credibility and earning contempt in nearly every nation of the world.

Increasingly our allies find a hard time distinguishing our actions from those of the Soviet Union. And that is a tragedy, because there is a difference—a very real one. This Nation has fought for freedom and justice throughout its history. Mining harbors in peacetime makes people forget the proud traditions we stand on.

Yesterday, I had the good fortune to meet with a delegation of foreign parliamentarians who have come here to question our policy in Central America. To a man, they could not understand why we insist on pursuing a military solution, and they do not believe

President Reagan when he says that the United States is not trying to topple the legitimate government of Nicaragua. They do believe that our policy is fueling anti-American feelings around the world, and that it drives Nicaragua closer to Cuba and the Soviet Union. And they fear that more of the same will gravely harm the interests of America and our allies in the West.

The misgivings of our friends from Europe and South America are convincing, and they are shared by a majority in this House, and a majority of the American people. It is time for the President to take notice.●

IN HONOR OF THE AWARDED OF THE EAGLE SCOUT TO DAVID THOMAS WALLACE

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, David Thomas Wallace, a senior at Delta High School in Clarksburg, Calif., will be awarded the Eagle Scout—the highest progress award of the Boy Scouts of America. David successfully completed a qualifying project that entailed the design, layout and installation of a numbering and address system for all the lots and houses in Clarksburg. I want to commend him publicly for this achievement and this honor.

The Boy Scouts is a tremendous organization. The good it does for the boys and young men of this Nation is well known. To achieve the level of Eagle Scout is a distinct accomplishment, and David has proven himself worthy of this award through his achievements in his school, his church and his community.

David is a member of the California Scholarship Federation and is listed in "Who's Who Among American High School Students." He is class vice president and class representative to the student council at Delta High. While maintaining an overall 3.65 grade point average, he has participated in basketball and baseball, was awarded Honorable Mention All League in football, and is also section leader in the school band.

In addition, David has received the Bank of America Music Award and the Soroptimist Citizenship Award, and was a delegate to Boys State. He is president of the Clarksburg Community Church Youth Group and a member of the church choir and worship committee.

David is a credit to his family, his Scout troop, and his community. I am sure he will be a success at the California State University at Fresno, where he will study health services adminis-

tration. I commend him for his attainment of the Eagle Scout Award.●

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS TOMEO

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who vote on billion-dollar appropriations and seek to manage the affairs of the Federal Government should always remember that the real work of helping people and building communities takes place not as a result of high-minded policy actions in Washington, but due to the efforts of individuals across this country who give of themselves in order to serve their neighbors.

They do their work in every community in America, helping individuals, building institutions, promoting health and education. The work of these volunteers is invaluable—it holds many communities together, and it serves as a beautiful example of the caring altruistic attitude that we want all citizens to have.

This work is not done for recognition—indeed, it often goes without proper recognition. These community volunteers who deserve recognition that most seem to need it the least, because their true satisfaction comes from the knowledge that they have helped improve someone else's life.

Tonight in my own home community, the people of Hackettstown will gather to honor one such individual, Mr. Thomas Tomeo, who has a 30-year record of service to his neighbors.

It is a special pleasure for me to pay tribute to him, because Tommy Tomeo is a personal friend, and adviser whose companionship, counsel, and enthusiasm have been valuable to me since I first thought of serving in Congress.

Mr. Tomeo will be honored for his work on the Hackettstown Community Hospital, a project which we have seen grow from a dream to a reality, thanks in great part to his efforts. Tommy has served on the hospital's board of directors since 1955, and presided over the hospital's first civic advisory council in 1971.

Tommy Tomeo also deserves honor for his participation in the affairs of other civic groups and charities, and for his participation in the affairs of the Warren County Republican Party.

So, while Tommy will be honored by the Hackettstown Community Hospital, he will receive the respect and gratitude of all the people and associations he has served in his continuing avocation of public service.

It is fitting that he be recognized in Hackettstown, where the direct benefits of his generous spirit are seen and felt.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

And it is fitting that we pay tribute to Thomas Tomeo in Congress, because he and others like him enrich our Nation through their daily labors, and keep in practice the great volunteer tradition that has symbolized the goodness of the American spirit for two centuries of our history.●

TRIBUTE TO JIM KELLY, MAYOR OF EL MONTE, CA

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I bring to your attention one of California's most distinguished citizens. Mr. Jim Kelly, mayor of the city of South El Monte, has lived in the State of California since 1948. His contribution to his city and State are a true testimony to this gentleman's honorable character. Now, at the time of his retirement, I join his wife Margaret, their five children and three grandchildren, in congratulating him on his fruitful and exciting career.

Jim Kelly has worked for Balian Ice Cream since 1964. During these years of dedicated service, Jim became actively involved with events and activities in his community. In 1965 he became the annexation chairman and in 1966 was street lighting chairman for the city of South El Monte. In 1967 Jim was the leader of the city clean-up campaign. Jim has also been actively involved with city planning throughout the years. Jim served as commissioner for city parks and recreation on two separate occasions and in 1975 he served as city planning commissioner. Jim was elected to the city council in March 1976, and was first elected mayor in April 1980, and re-elected in April 1982.

Some of the other services to his community include president of the Holy Name Society and chairman of the annual fiesta at the Epiphany Church. Jim has also been a Scout Master for the Boy Scouts for 11 years. As a charter member and post commander of the South El Monte American Legion Post 407, Jim has worked hard to insure that the veterans of this country continue to receive the recognition that they deserve. He served in the U.S. Navy from 1950 to 54. Jim is also a member of the Teamster Union.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to take part in this celebration of recognition of Jim Kelly's career. It is a great honor to have had the opportunity to know and work with such an accomplished individual.●

April 24, 1984

HOUSE DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP HINDERS THE FIGHT AGAINST CRIME

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, the Senate overwhelmingly passed, by a vote of 91 to 1, comprehensive criminal reform legislation. The Comprehensive Crime Control Act (S. 1762) is one of the most sweeping anticrime packages to move in Congress in nearly 14 years. It comprises over 40 key criminal matters including bail, sentencing, forfeiture, and insanity defense reform.

This landmark legislation received bipartisan support in the Senate and President Reagan praised its passage. Yet, such a worthwhile effort to help fight against the rising crime problem will probably die in the House thanks to the House Democratic leadership. The leadership has made it quite clear that they have no intention of dealing with this bill, calling it too controversial. What can be so controversial about legislation which will clean up our streets and make our communities safer to live in?

Nearly half of all Americans are afraid to walk in their own communities at night, and 1 in 6 fear for their safety in their own homes. Americans today view violent crime as one of the most important issues in America. Crime knows no political boundaries. It is deplorable that politics become more important than our security.

My Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, of which I am the ranking Republican member, has a track record of moving crime-related bills. Why is it that my subcommittee can be so successful? The answer is simple. The subcommittee chairman, BILL HUGHES and I do not let partisan politics cloud our judgment or dictate our direction. Our jobs as Members of Congress is to represent the people who elected us. BILL HUGHES and I work together as a team, not as adversaries, in producing sound anticrime measures. Unfortunately for the American public, this is too often the exception instead of the rule.

In January 1983, I introduced the Bail Reform Act to sharply curtail those crimes committed by persons awaiting trial, sentencing, or appeal. This is one of the provisions of the Senate crime package. Currently, Federal judges do not have the legal authority to consider a defendant's danger to the community and are forced to release dangerous defendants back into our community. To date, my Bail Reform Act is still bottled up in a subcommittee.

I am incensed that such a serious problem as crime reform is such a low priority of the House leadership. There is just no justification for failing to consider this anticrime package. The Senate pulled together and passed this bill and I would wager that the vast majority of Members in this House would wholeheartedly support this measure as well if given the chance. It is a crime that we will not have that chance.●

A BOOST FOR GREATER BUFFALO

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, all too often we read about the negatives of the Buffalo region—the stormy weather, the closing industries, the ghost town atmosphere of the mass transit construction area, and the general lack of excitement in the community.

Those of us who live in and love the greater Buffalo area know better. Hence we wear our pride in western New York on our sleeve or if so inclined, on a "Boost Buffalo" button on our collar. It is with that sense of pride that we read of the greatness of the greater Buffalo area in the April 22 issue of the *Washington Post*. David Beacon has discovered a small part of the wonder of western New York, including Niagara Falls, NY, and a host of exemplary cultural riches. We who know the area well, know that Beacon has missed much, but we welcome the recognition so well deserved.

Beacon's article entitled, "The Decline and Rise of Buffalo," follows:

[From the *Washington Post*, Apr. 22, 1984]

THE DECLINE AND RISE OF BUFFALO

(By David Beacon)

More than 300,000 souls call Buffalo home, and the remaining 4 billion of us have done a dandy job of putting them on the defensive. Justly so, it often appears—but then appearances can be deceiving.

The weather in this northwestern New York city does get nasty, there's no denying that. Time was when on the most blustery of winter days ropes went up beside downtown sidewalks to help Buffalo's windblown pedestrians haul themselves along.

Worse, despite its status as the state's second-largest city and its history as a significant manufacturing and shipping center, the place doesn't exactly make a good first impression. Buffalo's 42 square miles spread willy-nilly across a seemingly endless plain bordering Lake Erie and the Niagara River, and all that space has prompted a decidedly patchy pattern of development.

For the new arrival, an initial glimpse of the big high-rises at the center of town—a few blocks from the lakefront—might generate a spark of interest. Yet on closer acquaintance those buildings come across as lonely megaliths, most of them standing isolated and a little forlorn in a desert of roadways and parking lots. As a result, the heart

of the city seems down-at-the heels, weedy, and more than a tad dispirited.

Then, too, Buffalo has hardly established a reputation for high culture. Despite the general guffawing over, for example, Cleveland, the laughs stop when talk turns to that city's awesome orchestra. Who makes such distinctions about Buffalo? In the Broadway musical "A Chorus Line," the character who hails from Buffalo (as does the play's creator, Michael Bennett) goes so far as to say that in his hometown "suicide is redundant."

Funny how unforgiving we can be. After all, anyone who has ever suffered a setback that scads of people managed to find out about and bray over—and that means most of us—knows only too well the persuasive staying power of a loser's reputation. It doesn't actually require a real misstep to get in Dutch with the rest of the world; rumors, hearsay, out-and-out slander will do the trick. Most folks caught in that bind wish that—just once—the outside world would put the accent on the positive. So, as regard Buffalo, here goes.

To begin, not even the proudest of cities—not New York, not Washington, certainly—would turn up its nose at the dazzling riches of Buffalo's Albright-Knox Art Gallery. A couple of miles north of downtown on Elmwood Avenue, which en route passes a passel of formidable Victorian houses, the Albright-Knox owns so many big-time works that it tends to have a dizzying effect on visitors from towns where masterworks are doled out more sparingly.

The gallery occupies two very dissimilar buildings. The earlier structure has the look of the old National Gallery or the Philadelphia Museum. It's a turn-of-the-century palace of culture rendered in the classical revival manner long regarded as the only style that would do for places dedicated to public improvement.

The new building—a sleek, unassuming box designed by Gordon Bunshaft and opened in 1962—would, in many cities, represent a hopeful gesture, at best. Such buildings—even the National Gallery's East Building, for example—usually have gone up well before much materialized to fill them. Today, many such places in smaller cities sit half-empty, all dressed up but not likely to go much of anywhere. The story took a happier turn in Buffalo.

Bunshaft's structure can barely contain its abundance of first-rate works by the significant American and European artists of the last 30 years or so. Credit for the fact that this serious, yet immensely pleasurable, collection of modern art has found a home in Buffalo rests with the enlightened local patron Seymour H. Knox and with the staff of the museum he had a big part in paying for. But it also represents a broader achievement for a city generally thought to have few cultural assets or aspirations beyond the athletic antics of the Buffalo Bills.

Even on the most brilliant Sunday afternoon, a fair number of townfolk make their way to the Albright-Knox, and they come not in ritual deference to the art of the past but ready to take on the esthetic challenges of their own age. At the Albright-Knox, good things hang around just everywhere, and the modest scale of the individual galleries helps bring art and its public into an easily intimate relationship.

In the adjoining building, the dignified spaces of an old-time museum are given over to special exhibits and to bits and pieces of what the collection amounted to before the

Knox style and money took over. Oh, the rooms house some worthy items, but artistically the original building belongs in a different league.

Not that every old structure in Buffalo fails to hold its own against its more youthful neighbors—quite the contrary. Declining cities usually make matters worse by clearing away the remnants of their glory days—a practice that lends Buffalo and many other such places a vacant, impoverished air. So when venerable structures hang on largely intact, they emerge as stunning survivors. In Buffalo, the best of these is the Guaranty (later, Prudential) Building on Court Street near the center of town.

Designed in 1896 by Louis Sullivan and now one of that influential Chicagoan's few remaining works, the Guaranty Building over the years suffered the customary neglect as well as some slipshod renovations and a fire during the 1970s that did its part to clear out the remaining tenants. To the rescue came a team of out-of-town developers. They gave the building a painstaking sprucing-up that also restored its commercial appeal.

So far as it affects downtown Buffalo, the renovation was well worth the effort. The slender tower amounts to an exceedingly rare architectural concoction—a pretty skyscraper. Tall buildings can easily appear impressive; this one attains the more delicate, elusive qualities of lightness and grace. Its surface swirls with elaborately intertwining ornamental designs, and the ruddy terracotta of the facade brings a bold stroke of color to the otherwise over-whelmingly gray canvas of the center city.

Buffalo prides itself on its architectural masterworks, among them five houses created by Frank Lloyd Wright around the turn of the century, when the city had more than enough money and importance to command the attention of the nation's top designers. The only one open to the public is the biggest and best-known of the group—the Darwin Martin house, built in 1902 near Delaware Park for a leading Buffalo businessman.

John O'Hern, curator of the house, leads tours of its broad, low rooms and simultaneously conducts a gently comic exploration of the relationship between an architect and a client, each bent on having things his own way. As often happened, Wright prevailed. Eighty years later, the house appears fairly tatty; Wright never mastered the low-keep house, his repeated claims to the contrary notwithstanding. Still, the building establishes itself as an original and dynamic composition. And it offers a goodly number of Wright's special treats—not the least of these the inventive patterns of his leaded windows, lined up in long, glittering rows.

Actually, despite Buffalo's reputation as a low-life lout, its principal charms lie in the esthetic realm. In dramatic circles, the city's 20-year-old Studio Arena Theater has a solid reputation. Its recent production of "Cabaret," for instance, hummed with far greater temptation and menace than the musical ordinarily evokes.

However, no matter what the feelings generated onstage, the audience's spirits sink on leaving the theater. Studio Arena opens onto a city-scape straight out of "The Day After"—a stretch of Main Street blasted into barely identifiable smithereens. The culprit: construction of a combination streetcar-subway system that by the summer of 1985 will extend 6.4 miles from the center of town. In the meantime, the project blights a fair portion of downtown—

which, it must be said, looks none too resilient.

Despite all this, Studio Arena's neighborhood—called, appropriately enough, the Theater District—also offers Shea's Buffalo, an opulent old roadshow house, as well as a handful of sleekly designed restaurants. Not to mention the Anchor Bar, up Main and ostensibly the birthplace of Buffalo's deservedly famous chicken wings.

Also nearby is the section known as Allentown, along Allen Street between Main, Delaware (by fits and starts the city's most beautiful and urbane avenue) and Elmwood. Hardly Greenwich Village, Allentown nevertheless does manage a relative plenty of pedestrian traffic, good antiques at decent prices and some of Buffalo's cozier bars and restaurants.

Not far from Allentown, in a somewhat desolate block of Franklin Street, is Rue Franklin, a French restaurant of considerable success in realizing those aspirations. Like many good things in Buffalo, putting so fine a restaurant in so unprepossessing a setting seems, at best, misguided.

Yet the city and its enterprises constantly weather reverses great and small, a few of them self-inflicted. In 1901, President William McKinley came to town to put in an appearance at the Pan-American Exposition, a kind of high-minded World's Fair. Thanks to the marksmanship of an anarchist assassin, the visit ended badly for McKinley—and Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office in a big house (still standing) on Delaware Avenue.

In a gesture of atonement for McKinley, city leaders erected a monument at Niagara Square—plunk in the center of town. The obelisk and statuary that form McKinley's monument give the city's sole grand public space a worthy focal point. Over the long haul, however, the whole enterprise ensured only that Buffalo's most visible memorial marks not some local display of pluck (or even the admittedly tepid exploits of longtime residents Millard Fillmore and Grover Cleveland) but instead a source of national embarrassment.

The City Hall, facing Niagara Square, is a gloriously overdecorated relic of the Depression era that recalls Rockefeller Center, Mayan ruins and a Cecil B. De Mille set all at once. The views available from the building's top-floor observation deck take in the tremendous breadth of the region's landscape and, nearer at hand, the major downtown landmarks. Among these is the Liberty National Bank, its twin towers crowned with not one but two replicas of the distinguished lady from France who stands watch over New York Harbor. Buffalo's twin Statues of Liberty bear uplifted torches that blink alternately in a kind of double message to anyone nearby who might, perhaps, yearn to breathe free.

The vista over the city includes Buffalo's long, grassy waterfront as well. There is also the great sweep of Lake Erie itself, which looks positively oceanic from 28 stories up, and the silvery thread of the Niagara River.

Heading out of Buffalo, the river leads toward Lake Ontario. On the way, the Niagara makes a stop of sorts for the famous falls. And so should you. The drive from Buffalo along the Parkway on the Canadian side has its pleasant aspects.

The first visible evidence of the falls is a misty plume rising high into the air where the river takes its tumble. Closer up, the falls appear most imposing from Canada. They disappoint only those too world-weary to take a long, clear-eyed look.

An added benefit of crossing the border is that downtown Niagara Falls, Canada, offers some of the world's most-obvious tourist traps, including waxworks of every description as well as an Elvis Presley museum. It is not necessary (or even wise) to resist every one of these snares. The so-called Scenic Tunnels, which snake underground to provide views of the falls from an odd, low-down perspective, can provide a genuine thrill or two.

Visitors to the tunnels are equipped with boots and slickers before entering an elevator that leads to the tunnels below the falls. Once the elevator stops, the doors open to a long, dim passageway with three arms that reach out through the rock to the falls. The first gives onto a terrace where visitors peer up and, on days when the river is really rolling, get a fair dousing. The second opens to an alluring spectacle of billowing water and mist. And for some, a couple of seconds spent watching the action here might make the whole trip worthwhile. The third arm of the tunnel comes out under the falls and ends with a prepossessing, violent vision that says Watch Out. The power of nature asserts itself.

The Parkway beyond the town of Niagara Falls offers better scenery than on the way in. The landscape grows rocky, the forest dark and deep. The houses are prettier. Best of all, the road winds toward an idyllic destination—an old village called Niagara-on-the-Lake. The Shaw Festival, a well-regarded summer theater that devotes part of its season to George Bernard Shaw and much of the balance to his contemporaries, stands on the outskirts.

In the town, low buildings line the main street, the structures neat and varied and occasionally downright beautiful. The Prince of Wales Hotel, a Victorian confection topped off with a mansard roof, holds sway near the entrance to town, where the road divides to accommodate a diminutive clock tower. Shops, including a nicely stocked bookstore and a surprising number of good bakeries, edge the street. Just beyond the village, the road comes to a turn. And the view suddenly expands to take in the watery vastness of Lake Ontario.

When the makers of "The Dead Zone," a movie based on the novel by Stephen King, needed a perfect little American town in which to unfold their tale of horror, they found what they wanted across the border, in Niagara-on-the-lake. Robert Redford filmed his new movie, "The Natural," in Buffalo. Sylvester Stallone's trainer, Ray Notaro, is a native son, and he promises that his boy's continuing adventures (Rocky IX?) will include at least one bout shot on home turf.

Maybe these movie types have stumbled onto something that has eluded the rest of us. After all, it is probably a measure of America's magnificence that places like Buffalo so often end up overlooked or derided. A roughly equivalent town in Europe—with a top-flight museum, with exemplary works by two of the nation's greatest architects, with outstanding theater in town and more nearby, and with one of the continent's unparalleled natural wonders an hour away—would rank as a must-see in the guidebook, no matter what depredations the area had suffered since its heyday.

On this note, a personal remembrance comes to mind. When I was a tot, the youngest in a large and ever-expanding family, the whole brood made a pilgrimage to Niagara Falls. We stayed at the Statler in Buffalo. In those days, the hotel managed a

certain splendor. Decades later, I still can remember the sunny corner living room of the suite we occupied. Even my mother—an accomplished traveler and no stranger to lovely things—recalled the Statler as a notably agreeable place. Today, the hotel is a stately facade on Niagara Square enclosing a dismal hulk awaiting conversion to office space. A few immense chandeliers in the lobby are the only souvenirs of better times.

Well, like the Statler, we have all probably declined some over the years. Yet the passage of time and all the changes that come with it are not reason to give up, not for any of us. Perhaps that explains why the hometown folks get so defensive about Buffalo, or about any similar spot. Fighting back—keeping the forces of age and decline at bay—is a serious business that engages us all. In fact, it's known as staying alive. ●

CATHOLIC COMMUNITY SERVICES HONORED

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 27, 1984, a celebration will take place in my district in recognition of the outstanding and varied services provided by Catholic Community Services, Diocese of San Diego.

Since its formation in 1919, Catholic Community Services has maintained an invaluable social presence in San Diego by aiding over a half-million people through their various programs. These include essential emergency services, counseling for emotional problems, referrals for resettlement services, employment training for job placement, premarriage preparation, assistance during pregnancy and training for natural family planning.

Accordingly, Catholic Community Services has been responsible for, or assisted in, the development of other service providers such as ACCESS, ALMA, Centro De Asuntos Migratorios, Desert Valle Federal Credit Union, Ecumenical Service Center, Good Samaritan Shelter, House of Rachel, Rachel's Day Center, Imperial Valley People's Food Co-op, Noah Homes, Plaza Co-op, the Refugee Continental Craft Co-op, and the San Diego organizing project.

The Catholic Church has been a stable fixture of community aid in San Diego since 1919, and in 1949, Bishop Charles Francis Buddy established and committed the Diocese of San Diego to the support of the Catholic Casework Bureau. We in San Diego recognize and salute Bishop Buddy for his generous efforts, as well as Bishop Leo Thomas Maher who, on February 13, 1974, filed incorporation papers for Catholic Community Services to officially establish this organization as a public benefit corporation.

In recognition of Catholic Community Services' 10th anniversary as a corporation and 65th year of charitable, nonprofit service to the San Diego community, June 27, 1984, has been declared Catholic Community Services Day.

Mr. Speaker, I am most proud to have such a significant community service organization in my district and I urge my colleagues to join me in applauding their continued efforts now reaching a 65th year. Their deeds shall not go unnoticed. ●

EL SALVADOR AND MILITARY AID

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives must soon address the issue of emergency military aid to El Salvador. Much of our previous debate has centered around the existence of rightwing death squads; I suspect the upcoming debate will be predictably similar. In fact, recent accusations levied by former Ambassador to El Salvador, Robert E. White, have proliferated the level of death-squad debate.

In preparation for House consideration of emergency military aid to El Salvador, I commend the following article from the Wall Street Journal to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Friday, Apr. 6, 1984]

SALVADORAN REACTS TO AMBASSADOR WHITE'S ACCUSATION

(By Luis Escalante Arce)

Earlier this year, Robert E. White, former U.S. ambassador to El Salvador, announced that six Salvadoran exiles living in Miami were, in large measure, responsible for directing the activities of right-wing death squads in their homeland. As one of those cited by the ex-ambassador, I would like to describe the facts that are rarely, if ever, discussed in connection with the current situation in El Salvador.

Just a few years before the Oct. 15, 1979, fall of Salvador's little-lamented President Carlos Humberto Romero, the country was held in the grip of an orchestrated campaign of terror. Banks and stores were being robbed with impunity, labor strikes were paralyzing factories, public buses were being burned and the kidnapping of widely known and honored community leaders was on the upswing.

Among the many who were kidnapped, and for whom large ransoms were paid, I recall the following: Francisco de Sola, industrialist; Benjamin Sol Millet, agribusiness entrepreneur; Ian Chatterton and Cameron Massey, officers of the Bank of London and Montreal, held for several months; Jose David Escobar, farmer; Carlos Emilio Alvarez, physician; Jaime Batlle, coffee exporter, held captive for almost a year; Ernesto Sol Meza, industrialist; Miguel Miguel, industrialist; Fritz Schuitema, Dutch executive of Philips N.V.; Emilio

Charur, merchant; Jaime D. Hill, large-scale farmer; Teofilo Siman, merchant, for whom ransom was paid twice; Dimas Funes Hartman, physician; Tomas Peralta, broker; Domingo Call, industrialist; Miguel Arturo Duenas, investor, and Jose Venutolo, farmer.

I also remember a number who were murdered by would-be kidnappers or who died while being held by leftist bands. They include: Ernesto Regalado, investor; Ernesto Liebes, merchant and honorary consul of Israel in El Salvador; Archibald G. Dunn, ambassador from South Africa to El Salvador; Hogo Weil, charge d'affaires from Switzerland; Mauricio Borgonovo Pohl, foreign minister of El Salvador; Eduardo Guirola, large-scale farmer; Roberto Poma, president of the government tourist agency, murdered by kidnappers before payment of ransom; Fugio Matsumoto, Japanese textile manufacturer; Raul Molina, industrialist; Nicolas Nasser, merchant and past president of the local Chamber of Commerce, and Elena de Chiurato, coffee-export executive, never released despite payment of ransom, and presumed dead.

During all these crimes, throughout this entire period of anarchy, those who now clamor to get on the human-rights bandwagon in El Salvador were silent. The naked feeling of insecurity that plagued the populace during this period produced an atmosphere of deep discouragement, humiliation and fear. People from all walks of life chose to leave El Salvador; it is estimated that emigration since 1979 exceeds half a million. Among this number are refugees in Miami, Fla., and among these are the people whom Mr. White accuses of directing the "death squads."

I think it is fitting to point out that I was kidnapped in San Salvador on Oct. 6, 1979. After my family paid a large ransom to my kidnappers, I was released, but not all in one piece. Seriously wounded during the kidnapping, and given only an occasional sip of water plus a handful of dry cornflakes every few days during my month of captivity, I was close to death. I was flown to Jackson Memorial Hospital in Miami on Nov. 5, 1979. The rebuilding of my bullet-riddled legs was then begun at Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore, and my struggle to recover fully continues to this day.

While kidnappings and murders were—and remain—the stock in trade of Salvador's communist guerrillas, their propaganda efforts were a key ingredient in their attempts to ensnare El Salvador and discredit its industry and its will to progress. First, publicity and widespread circulation was given to a statistic that the country's land and wealth was controlled by "fourteen families." This figure was so demonstrably and ridiculously inaccurate that it soon went out of vogue.

Next came energetic attacks (as prescribed by Lenin) on the "oligarchy" in a campaign to power a movement bent on the destruction of private enterprise. However, the attackers found it increasingly difficult to apply a term meaning "rule-by-a-few" to tens of thousands of entrepreneurs. The term "oligarchy" soon lost currency in Salvadoran circles (though the term, apparently has had a longer run among the ill-informed in the U.S.).

Finally came the horrifying specter of "right-wing death squads." Never mind the fact that communist guerrillas are responsible for many of the civilian deaths. Or that many of the politicians being murdered are conservatives. These facts do not alter the premise, says Mr. White, that civilian politi-

cal murders in El Salvador are caused by right-wing death squads that are directed by Roberto d'Aubuisson and the "Miami Six." Perhaps it should be mentioned that one of Mr. White's "Six," Juan Ricardo, has been dead for more than two years. And Mr. White had to retract his indictment of another "Miami Six" member after it was proved that the man had never lived in Miami and had never been a member of the party to which Mr. White had assigned him. Mr. White also had accused this same man of having conspired to kill Archbishop Oscar Romero; it was later disclosed that the man was a personal friend of the archbishop.

As for myself, I am now living in New York City, and am saddened by the hostility I seem to have attracted from Mr. White. This is in direct contrast to the splendid hospitality I have found among others in the U.S. I have been received here with kindness, not only by friends, but by Americans I have met casually and unexpectedly. Above all, the compassion and sensitive humanity of the American doctors and nurses who have attended me through my long and difficult surgery and treatment has been outstanding.

The U.S., the most magnanimous country economically that the world has ever known, in all good faith makes a mistake when it attempts to transform underdeveloped countries overnight. At times, the headlong rush to sow democracy abroad, without essential understanding of the countries in which the planting is to be done, produces consequences quite the opposite of the good intended by the planters. This mistake is compounded by those who, for ideological reasons, wish to see in Central America profound social changes inimical to economic and political freedom. The Carter administration gave its support to the Sandinista movement without analyzing its makeup, and we now see that Nicaragua is a country under Soviet-Cuban rule.

All this should not leave the reader pessimistic. The will to persevere against the terrorism and anarchy that threaten to destroy El Salvador comes from the heart of the Salvadoran people. Salvadorans have proven to be impervious to the brainwashing shampoo applied to our unwilling heads by leftist intellectuals and by the tiny minority of Salvadoran Marxists.

Mr. Escalante is a banker who now lives with his wife in New York. ●

A TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM AND LILLY ROZAY

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, William and Lilly Rozay will be honored on Wednesday, May 16, 1984, at the San Fernando Valley Child Guidance Clinic's seventh annual Humanitarian Award Dinner.

In 1947, William and Lilly, refugees of the Nazi concentration camps, arrived in the United States. Together they created a successful trucking business, Rozay Transfer. William, a respected leader in the trucking industry, has served as president and chair-

man of the board of the California Trucking Association.

William and Lilly, in addition to their successful business, have an impressive record of community service. William has been active in the Beverly Hills Lodge Knights of Pythias; he is one of the founders of the American Friends of Hebrew University in Jerusalem; and served as executive vice president of the City of Hope Merchants' Club in charge of fund-raising.

Locally, Lilly is involved with the Clef Palate Guild and the Crippled Children's Society. She has also organized a shoe drive for orphaned children in Israel, and has aided Russian emigree to Israel.

I commend William and Lilly Rozay for their many devoted contributions to the community, and ask the Members to join with the San Fernando Valley Child Guidance Clinic in honoring them. ●

TEMPLE EMANUEL PAYS TRIBUTE TO THE COURAGEOUS DANISH PEOPLE IN WORLD WAR II

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend Rabbi A. Allen Block and the congregation of Temple Emanuel of Canarsie, in Brooklyn, for furthering the cause of Judaism and Ecumenism.

On March 23, 1984, Temple Emanuel officially paid tribute to the Danish People for their humanitarian efforts during World War II. According to historians, the April 1940 Nazi invasion into Denmark was to be the beginning of deportation and annihilation of Danish Jewry. The Danish people, however, under the leadership of King Christian X, managed to organize a rescue operation for their Jewish neighbors. Danish Jews were thus saved from the tragic fate that befell so many European Jews.

In attendance at the commemorative service were the Honorable Birger Lehman Nielsen, Danish Deputy Consul General; Pastor William H. Gentz of Salem Evangelical Lutheran Church, as well as members of Danish-American community organizations.

The congregation of Temple Emanuel, through its commemorative prayer service, set a fine example for future efforts to enhance community cohesiveness. ●

SOVIET VIGIL

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have this opportunity to participate in this year's Soviet Vigil as sponsored by my colleague LAWRENCE COUGHLIN. Yet, I am deeply saddened that the necessity for such a congressional vigil still exists. It is inconceivable to me that just a short time ago, in 1979, Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union was at its peak of 51,320. 1983's statistics reflected a drastic decrease of only 1,314 Jews allowed to emigrate. In March 1983, 101 Jews were granted permission to emigrate, a drop of 2,948 since 1980. This March, only 51 Jews were allowed to emigrate. This dramatic reduction in people permitted to emigrate from the U.S.S.R. is frightening in its implications. What happens to the thousands still left behind?

Many Jews in the Soviet Union who are denied permission to emigration depend on American gifts for their basic survival. Until recently, the only problem these gifts presented was that the receiver in the Soviet Union had to pay an expensive import duty; however, now Soviet authorities have legislated a new law. Essentially what this law does is to place a 10-year prison sentence on any Soviet citizen who exists on such American donations. Survival for those who receive such gifts is in serious jeopardy.

The Lifshitz family, who have been denied permission to emigrate four times since 1981 and led a hunger strike in protest, now face a new and greater dilemma. According to a recent correspondence with Vladimir, he was not long ago ordered to meet with officials to be questioned. Upon his arrival, he observed that the room he was to be interrogated in was filled with electronic equipment—that is, cameras and tape machines. During his questioning, insinuating and inflammatory accusations were hurled at him, with the purpose of making him implicate himself as involved in illegal activities. Vladimir is apprehensive about the futures of his wife and young children. As he says, "the system is greater than I. I can only rely on myself and my friends." His was a fatalistic attitude bred from many needless disappointments.

Thirty-seven-year-old Nadezhda Fradkova is another Jew who has been left behind. Since 1978, Nadezhda has steadfastly applied for emigration permission and been denied. In January of this year, Nadezhda was forcibly removed from her place of residence and was held in Leningrad hospital in isolation for 75 days. During that time she was subjected to the most cruel

and inhumane treatment. Nadezhda was under 24 hour KGB surveillance; daily a "doctor" would come, shake her and scream anti-Semitic obscenities in her ears. She was given hallucinogens so that time was a blur and her health was dangerously impaired. So bad was Nadezhda's treatment at the hands of her captors that she began a hunger strike that lasted 25 days until the hospital force fed her.

Nadezhda has recently been released from the hospital and her health is still poor. Although she has two degrees in mathematical linguistics, she cannot even get a job as a street cleaner. Her clothes have been stolen by the KGB and her house is constantly being searched by them. She consequently wrote to the Soviet officials renouncing her citizenship, explaining that she could not be a citizen of a country that cannot protect her from its own political machine.

Nadezhda now only wants to die, for she is in a living death situation. The only thing holding her back is that she does not want to give the Soviet officials the satisfaction of driving her to kill herself.

My friends, the Jews in the Soviet Union are unwitting players in a cat-and-mouse game—in which they will lose completely unless we help. We can no longer sit idly by and observe the persecution of a people. We must make it clearly known that human rights is of topmost priority and cannot be disregarded. Too long have too many suffered needlessly. We must stand as a strong and unified deliberative body to insure the equality of all people and all beliefs. ●

DR. LEONARD SERVETTER
RETIREES

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute today to a great American who is leaving public service. Dr. Leonard Servetter is retiring June 30, 1984, having given 34 years of quality leadership to the Chula Vista, CA public school system. Nine of these years have been spent as superintendent. His stewardship in public education warrants highlighting some of his accomplishments here today.

Dr. Servetter has shown leadership in every field level of education in our public school system. Few can match his record of community service. He has been president of the South County Chapter of the United Way and a board member of the Chula Vista Chamber of Commerce. Dr. Servetter has authored a number of publications, as well as keynoted numerous conferences and workshops. This

broad-based community service and involvement deserves our utmost commendation.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Dr. Serretter. His leadership serves as a model of the brand of educational and community leadership needed today. We will certainly have large shoes to fill in his absence.●

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR FRANK CHURCH

HON. BALTASAR CORRADA

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to a courageous and dedicated public servant, the late Senator Frank Church, who passed away recently.

Senator Church's interests and knowledge ranged from conservation and environmental concerns to national security and defense matters and his arguments often underlined and defined the scope of these issues. Frank Church was elected to the Senate as one of its younger Members and went on to become a trusted statesman to whom colleagues paid the ultimate compliment of listening to and respecting his views and analyses of events that have shaped our lives.

As a law student, Frank Church had courageously survived cancer and went on to accomplish much during his public service. Still, his early death has deprived the Nation of a man of wisdom and strong beliefs who strove to help guide our country.

Our sympathy and prayers are with his widow Bettina and their two sons.●

ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE THROUGH THE MEMORIAL DAY DISTRICT WORK PERIOD

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice has been working on two major projects this session. The first is sentencing reform legislation. Both the chairman of the Judiciary Committee (Mr. RODINO) and I have expressed our strong support for reforming Federal sentencing practices. We have introduced sentencing reform legislation, and the Criminal Justice Subcommittee has conducted 4 days of hearings on sentencing reform. Four more hearings are scheduled, and I expect to be able to conclude the hearings in May.

The subcommittee's second major project is legislation to help the innocent victims of crime. The subcommittee has held five hearings on this legislation, focusing principally on H.R. 3498, a bill sponsored by Messrs. RODINO, BERMAN, and some 50 other Members of Congress. The administration recently sent its proposed legislation to Congress, and the subcommittee will, of course, look carefully at it. I expect to complete hearings on crime victim legislation in early June.

In addition to these major projects, the subcommittee has been working on several other matters. The subcommittee has already held hearings on some of these matters, such as improving Federal criminal fine collection and H.R. 4826, a bill to prohibit non-consensual tape recording of telephone calls by Federal officials. Other matters, such as bank fraud and bank bribery and contraband in Federal prisons, will be the subject of hearings in May and ought to be ready for markup. Some portions of S. 1762 pending before the subcommittee appear to be noncontroversial and can be marked up without the necessity of a hearing.

The subcommittee schedule through the end of the Memorial Day district work period is as follows:

Wednesday, April 25—hearing on H.R. 5406, the Foreign Evidence Rules Amendment Act of 1984—10 a.m., room 2226, Rayburn House Office Building.

Thursday, April 26—hearing on H.R. 5405, the Financial Bribery and Fraud Amendments Act of 1984—10 a.m., room 2226, Rayburn House Office Building.

Wednesday, May 2—hearing on contraband in Federal prisons.

Thursday, May 3—hearing on sentencing reform legislation.

Wednesday, May 9—hearing on sentencing reform legislation.

Thursday, May 10—hearing on sentencing reform legislation.

Wednesday, May 16—markup.

Thursday, May 17—markup.

Wednesday, May 23—markup.●

SAVING MEDICARE DOLLARS

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, Medicare is facing bankruptcy and we are facing some tough choices in finding solutions to this enormous problem. I believe that we need to examine all less-costly means of providing high-quality health care in looking for ways to bring Medicare back to solvency and curtail the high cost of health care.

One of the alternatives we should examine is Medicare reimbursement of

occupational therapy services on an outpatient basis.

Occupational therapy (OT) services are a vital means toward rehabilitation and independence for stroke, heart attack, and arthritic patients. Currently, these important services are reimbursed under Medicare only when performed through the outpatient department of a Medicare certified hospital. Occupational therapy services provided in this setting are far more costly, generally, than in community settings, such as rehabilitation agencies or outpatient clinics.

In fact, the average cost of 1 hour of occupational therapy treatment in the outpatient department of a hospital is \$63. But the same hour of treatment provided by a rehabilitation agency, such as an Easter Seals Center, is \$48 and in a private outpatient clinic is only \$36.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is ludicrous under any circumstances for Medicare to be paying almost twice as much for OT services than it has to, and under today's financial circumstances, it makes no sense at all.

I firmly believe we should take a close look at the cost-saving possibilities in providing occupational therapy services in community settings and that we should move toward such reimbursement practices if savings would occur. Even beyond the fact that patients would benefit by OT services in community locations, the possible cost savings are just too good to overlook.●

IN HONOR OF THE AWARDED OF THE EAGLE SCOUT TO WYNNE GRANT YELLAND

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, Wynne Grant Yelland, a senior at Delta High School in Clarksburg, Calif., will be awarded the Eagle Scout—the highest progress award of the Boy Scouts of America. As his qualifying project, Wynne successfully designed and installed an automatic irrigation system for the Clarksburg Community Church grounds. I want to commend him publicly for this achievement and this honor.

The Boy Scouts have, for years, been helping the boys and young men of this Nation develop into mature, responsible citizens—the leaders of tomorrow. The attainment of the level of Eagle Scout is a distinct accomplishment, and Wynne has proven himself worthy of this award through his achievements in his school, his church, and his community.

I had the pleasure of meeting Wynne when I spoke to a student body

rally at Delta High. Wynne introduced me at that event. He is the student body vice president, president of the Spanish Club, Delta High representative to the Lions Club, and a life member of the California Scholarship Federation. He has participated in football and track, the band and drama—where he was awarded the Star Actor. He is also the vice president of the Clarksburg Community Church Youth Group. It is impressive that despite this busy schedule, Wynne has maintained a perfect overall grade point average of 4.0.

Wynne has received the Bank of America Science and Mathematics Plaque Award and is an academic all American. He is recognized as one of those in Who's Who Among American High School Students and the Society of Distinguished American High School Students.

Wynne is a credit to his family, his Scout troop, and his community. He will certainly continue his success at the University of California at Berkeley, where he will begin studying architecture in the College of Environmental Design this fall. I commend

him for his attainment of the Eagle Scout Award.●

CONGRESSIONAL AWARD RECOMMENDATION

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the achievements of a young Coast Guard Reserve Unit who have recently been recommended to receive the ROA Congressional Award.

On October 13, 1979, the Coast Guard Reserve Unit, Station Ponce de Leon Inlet, was formed. Just 4 years later, on November 25, 1983, Comdr. G. R. Merrilees submitted Reserve Unit Ponce as a candidate to receive the coveted 1983 ROA Congressional Award.

The accomplishments that make this unit deserving of their recommendation and this award of distinction are numerous. One man instrumental

in this unit achieving such excellence, is Lt. Joel Atwood, now a commanding officer, who guided them through its early days of existence to become one of the highest achieving units around.

Those achievements began with Lieutenant Commander Atwood's unit receiving a "high excellence" rating at their first biannual inspection. Since then they have been commended for an "improved readiness posture, augmentation program and active training, strong recruiting and public information programs and high morale within the unit."

Lieutenant Commander Atwood must also be commended for his contributions to this unit, as well as each individual reserve officer for excellence in their responsibilities, because without group effort this distinction would not be possible.

Coast Guard Reserve Unit, Station Ponce de Leon Inlet, you are a group filled with pride and professionalism. I take this opportunity to salute you for your achievements, and wish you "Good luck" toward receiving the ROA Congressional Award, and all else you strive for in the future.●